



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Aspects of the Vedic Dative.—By E. WASHBURN HOPKINS,
Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

1. **Dative and Genitive after bhū and āsti.**

In a previous paper¹ I have sufficiently illustrated the use of the dative after bhū as equivalent to “come,” e. g. bhuvad vīryāya, “came to power,” and in this sense, interchangeable with a regular verb of motion, bhava, “(be-)come (to help),” and āgahi, “come (to help).” Whereas bhū, even in the indicative, with an objective dative of this sort is not uncommon (bhū with the genitive is rare), āsti in the indicative is normal with the genitive and rare with the dative.²

Thus in 5. 65. 4, mitrásya hí . . sumatír āsti vidhatás, if vidhatás is not in agreement with mitrásya (cf. 8. 78. 7, krátva ít pūrṇám udāraṁ turāsyā ’sti vidhatás), the normal construction is found, but in 6. 65. 4, idā hí vo vidhaté rātnam asti, the construction is abnormal for RV. The perfect āsa has only possessive genitive after it, and this is the case with the imperfect āsīt. In 5. 30. 15, gharmás cit taptāḥ pravṛje sa āsīt, the meaning is evidently (not “came to” but) “was heated

¹ *The Vedic Dative Reconsidered*, Trans. Am. P. Ass., vol. xxxvii, p. 87 ff. Here, as there, to avoid confusion with English ‘as,’ I write, āsti. References, unless otherwise marked, are to RV.

² As with other verbs of movement, the locative takes the place of the dative after bhū in AV. 15. 11. 11, nikāmé nikāmāya bhavati. That bhavati here is not simply “is” may be seen from the preceding ānaṁ nikāmó gacchati, “Unto him comes his desire and he comes-to-be-in (gets to) the desire of desire.” Compare, after máhyam pavatām, loc. kāme in RV. 10. 128. 2, but dat. kāmāya in the same phrase, AV. 5. 3. 3, “May (the wind) blow for me unto (at) my desire.” The fact that jāgrhi, “watch,” takes either dat. or loc. shows that both are felt in a similar relation, though the meaning varies as in “look out for” and “watch over” (cf. also ádhi with loc. after the same verb). We cannot assume that one (loc.) object is felt as such and the other (dat.) is a vague “in regard to.” There is here no difference of personal dat. and impersonal loc.; vayodhēyāya, gārhapatyaya, 10. 25. 8 and 85. 27 are abstract datives, “watch to give strength,” “look out for the house-keeping,” but prajāsv ātmāsu goṣu jāgrhi, AV. 3. 15. 7, “watch over us,” etc., loc.

unto" (for); in 10. 34. 2, śivá . . máhyam āsīt, the dative of course depends on śivá; in 10. 102. 6, kakārdave vṛṣabhó yuktá āsīt, the traditional interpretation makes the dative final. There is no instance where āsa or āsit, "was," is used, as are the preterites of bhū, "(be-)came," with an object-dative. In the present indicative there are a few cases of stereotyped character, where āsti and śanti are employed with the dative, as given in the note below.¹

¹ The dative after the present of āsti seems to be almost restricted to instances evidently influenced by the prevailing use of certain nouns meaning "aid, protection, gifts," with verbs of giving, becoming, etc. Thus, like the rare exception (above) vidhaté rātnam āsti, there are a few examples of the worshipper in the dative with santi, where the subject is "gift, help," etc. The regular and prevailing use of the word várūtham, for example, is after a verb meaning "become" or "extend" (protection to the worshipper). Thus 1. 58. 9, bhāvā várūtham grṇaté; 1. 23. 21, pṛṇīta . . varūtham tanvé máma; 7. 30. 4, yácha sūribhya upamām várūtham; 7. 88. 6, yandhí . . stuvaté várūtham; 8. 79. 3, yantā'si várūtham (with dative and ablative, "protection to thy servants from thy haters"). It is in accordance with this that we find, in one hymn only, tēṣāṃ hī . . várūtham āsti dāsūṣe . . yād vaḥ . . sunvaté várūtham āsti, 8. 67. 3 and 6 (but agnir várūtham máma, "Agni of me the protection," in 1. 148. 2; so in 7. 32. 7). With "gift," dādhāti rātnam vidhaté, 4. 12. 3, may be the model for vidhaté rātnam āsti; as ābhūd u vo vidhaté ratnadhéyam idā naro dāsūṣe mártvāya, 4. 34. 4, for ratnadhéyāni santi . . sudāse, 7. 53. 3; yáthā hy āsti te . . rātiḥ . . dāsūṣe, 8. 24. 9. Yet it is more likely that the verbals dhā, rā, help to produce the dative, since "bestow" and "give" regularly call for this case. There are, however, a few examples in which this does not apply: yā te santi dāsūṣe ādhrṣṭā gíras, 7. 3. 8; evā hī te víbhūtaya ūtāyas . . sadyās cit santi dāsūṣe, 1. 8. 9; sóma yās te mayobhūva ūtāyaḥ śanti dāsūṣe, 1. 91. 9; yā vām santi puruspṛho niyūto dāsūṣe narā, 4. 47. 4; yā vaḥ śárma śaśamānāya santi, 1. 85. 12. Though here "give to" or "become to" (the pious) a guard (śárma) is also a common phrase, 1. 58. 9, etc. Of another sort are the datives with santi in 9. 61. 30, yā te . . āyudhā tigmanī santi dhūrvane; 10. 44. 7, yé prāg ūpare śanti dāvane; 9. 78. 2; srutāyaḥ santi yātave, "which weapons are sharp to hurt," "who are late (?) to give," "paths are to go." These are generally introduced by the imperative (future), pātave sómo astu, 1. 108. 2; santu . . rákṣase hāntavā u, 5. 2. 10 (etc., see more examples below). In Avestan also the dative after 'be' is usually after a form of future sense, nairē aṇhat, "will be to the man"; mōi astu, "be to me," etc., but the possessive dative with the indicative or even without verbal form, "these are to me," "the flames to (= of) fire" (*Casuslehre*, p. 220) is also found.

On the other hand, those modal forms of *ásti* which (like *bhū* in any mode) indicate not being but going to be (becoming) take a dative which may be final or may indicate that the subject will be (i. e. is coming to) the dative object. There are, for example, scarcely any cases like that with *vidhaté* and *ásti* above, but not uncommon are such cases as 6. 68. 7, *surībhyas . . . rayīḥ syāt*, "wealth shall be (=come) to the *Sūris*," and 1. 8. 5, *mahitvām astu vajrīṇe*, "greatness shall be (=come) to the bolt-holder." A good example of the future sense is given by 10. 7. 4, *dyúbhir asmā ābhabhir vāmām astu*, "happiness shall be to him through (all) his days." So in 1. 147. 4, *púnar astu so asmāi*, where the subject is a curse which "shall return to him"; and in 4. 1. 8, *dhiyé satyām astu* is "the prayer shall be realized," literally, "reality shall be (come) to the prayer."

Other examples of the future sense of *ásti* (in imperative, subjunctive, optative) parallel to *bhū* are: *asad vṛdhé*, 1. 89. 5; *syāma vṛdhé*, 8. 63. 10; *edhi no vṛdhé*, 5. 9. 7; 10. 7; 16. 5 (the only case, being a repeated phrase, of *edhi* with final dative);² *rāyāḥ syāma dharūṇaṁ dhiyādhyāi* ("may we get to establish wealth's foundation"), 7. 34. 24; *syāma bhúvaneṣu jivāse*, 9. 86. 38; *syāma te dāvāne vásūnām*, 2. 11. 1 (cf. 12 and 10. 36. 12); *dānāya mānaḥ . . astu te*, 1. 55. 7 (cf. *māno kṛṣya*, "make up your mind to" with *vasudéyāya*, 1. 54. 9; AV.

¹ In 6. 52. 2, *tápūṇṣi tasmāi vṛjināni santu*, "his sins shall come as burnings (torments) to him" is in connection with the associated phrase, 3, "cast the burning weapon at him who hates the Brahman" (dative). Compare AV. 4. 18. 6, *cakāra bhadram asmābhyam ātmāne tāpanaṁ tū sās*, "he made good for us, but for himself a burning." Any modifier may of course bring out the dative, irrespective of the verb, as in 7. 20. 5, *prā . . yāḥ nṛbhyo asti*; 10. 15. 2, *pitṛbhyo nāmo astu*; and so in 1. 109. 1, *nā'nyā yuvāt prāmatir asti māhyam*, the dative depends not on the verb *asti* but on *prāmatī*, just as in the verbal form, *prā manmahe śavasānāya sūṣām*, 1. 62. 1 (in 10. 100. 11, *prāmatī* takes the genitive, "care of" for "care for"). In 1. 91. 15=7. 55. 1, *sākhā suśéva edhi nas*, if *nas* is dative it depends on the adjective; so in *suhāvo na edhi*, 4. 1. 5 (cf. 6. 52. 6).

² In contrast with *asmākam id vṛdhé bhava*, 1. 79. 11; no *vṛdhé bhava*, 1. 91. 10; *bhāvā naḥ . . sākhā vṛdhé*, 1. 91. 17; *bhāvā stotṛbhyo āntamaḥ svastāye*, 3. 10. 8 (cf. 8. 13. 3); *bhāvā naḥ śubhra sātāye*, 5. 5. 4; *bhāvā sumātsu no vṛdhé*, 6. 46. 3 (and 11); *bhāvā vṛdhā indra rāyō asyā*, 7. 30. 1; *śivō bhava . . vājasātāye*, 8. 4. 18; *rucé bhava*, 9. 105. 5, the solitary instance with *edhi* (above) is typical.

3. 4. 4); *asat ta utsó gr̥naté*, 9. 89. 6 (the only case of this subjunctive, in the ninth book); *té syāma devāvītaye*, 10. 35. 14; *tád vām astu sáhase* . . *sávas*, 7. 104. 3; *vísṽ stotṛbhyo gr̥naté ca santu* (*sāubhagā*), 7. 3. 10; *vísṽhā 'smāi śaraṇá santv átra*, 10. 18. 2. Cases of doubtful forms are common: *vr̥ṣṭáyah santv asmé*, 7. 101. 5; *sumnám asmé te astu*, 1. 114. 10 (5. 53. 9); *astu dráviṇam* . . *asmé*, 10. 35. 13; *té naḥ santu yújas*, 8. 83. 2; *tán naḥ pratnám sakhyám astu yuṣmé*, 6. 18. 5; etc. In the following cases the dative depends only vaguely on *astu*, "be (resting) in the heart to," *ayám sú túbhyam* . . *hr̥dí stóma úpaśritas cid astu*, 7. 86. 8; (*vo astu*) *ayám ca sómo hr̥dí*, 10. 32. 9; *idám vácaḥ parjányāya* . . *hr̥dó astv ántaram*, 7. 101. 5. When the genitive is found it is possessive, not objective, as in 10. 103. 4, *asmákam edhy avitá ráthānām* (not "be to us"). So in *ná'smákan asti tát táras* . . *atiskáde*, "the strength of us is not to be conquered," not "strength is to us," 8. 67. 19; and in 5. 28. 3, *táva dyumnány uttamáni santu*; 10. 51. 9, *táva* . . *santu bhāgāḥ*, *tāvā 'gne yajñás* . . *astu*; 1. 39. 2, *yuṣmákam astu táviṣi páníyasī*, the idea is not "greater glory shall (be) come to thee," etc., but "thy glory shall be greater." This point is frequently disregarded. In 1. 173. 10, *asmákā'sad indro vájrahastas*, the meaning is not "unser (or bei uns) wird Indra sein, der den Keil hält," but "our Indra shall be a bolt-holder." In 8. 2. 7, *tráya índrasya*, etc., translate "Indra's somas shall be three"; in 1. 7. 10 (13. 10), *asmákam astu kévalas*, "all ours shall he be"; in 8. 31. 3, *tasya dyumnán asad ráthas*, "his car"; in 8. 89. 4, *śrávas cit te asad br̥hát*, "great be thy glory." This possessive genitive is the regular construction with *ásti* as it often is with *astu*, in distinction from the sense with the dative and *astu*. Thus, *asmákam santu bhúvanasya gopás*, 7. 51. 2, not "to us come," but "ours be"; *té asya santu ketávas*, 9. 70. 3, "must be his beams"; *taśya bhrátā madhyamó asti*, 1. 164. 1, "his brother"; *ná* . . *brahmānām ṛṇám* . . *asti*, 8. 32. 16, "no debt of"; *yásya* . . *vr̥trahá śúṣmo asti*, 1. 100. 2, "whose strength is foe-killing"; *yá āmasya kraviṣo gandhó asti*, 1. 162. 10, "what smell is of flesh"; *yá eṣām* . . *mahimá satyó asti*, 1. 167. 7, "what greatness of them is real"; *ná yásya (asya) vartá* . . *asti*, 1. 40. 8; 4. 20. 7; 6. 66. 8; *te rádhasas*, 8. 14. 4 (so *te* in 5. 29. 14, *ná te vartá* . . *asti*, must be genitive); *sárvaṁ tád astu te ghr̥tám*, 8. 102. 21; *távet tát satyám* (1. 1.

6), *sc.* asti, and cf. *táva tát satyám astu*, 1. 98. 3; *tán nú satyám pávamānasyā'stu . . jyótir yád áhne ákṛṇot*, etc., 9. 92. 5.

In marked contrast, the genitive with *bhū* is as uncommon as it is common with *ásti*. I have found only 2. 24. 14, *bráhmaṇas páter abhavat . . satyó manyús*; 10. 142. 3, *khilyá urvárāṇām bhavanti*; 10. 130. 4, *agnér gāyatrī abhavat sayúgvā*; 4. 7. 2, *ágne kadá ta anuśág bhúvad devásya cétanam*; 6. 16. 18, *nahí te pūrtám akṣipád bhúvan nemānām vaso* (a doubtful construction).¹ I think all these are really independent of *bhū*, not as with the dative after *bhū*, the object of the verb. Thus: "Bṛhaspati's anger became real," (not "ihm ward"); (when the fire burns) "there arise bare spaces of (=between) the fields"; "the gāyatrī became Agni's yoke-fellow"; "when will be the appearance of thee" (so Ludwig), not "wann wurde . . dir," etc. In 10. 61. 23, *vípraḥ prēṣṭhaḥ sá hy èśām babhúva*, "priest dearest to them he became," has the same construction with *prēṣṭha* as in 1. 167. 10, *vayám adyéndrasya prēṣṭhās*, and makes it unnecessary to take the genitive with *bhū* even as partitive, "became (one) of them" (Grassmann). The only case where the objective genitive with *bhū* seems to be required is 1. 17. 4, *yuváku hí śácīnām yuváku sumatinām bhūyāma vājadāvnām*, "may we become of your generous goodwill," where the genitive is felt as a sort of partitive objective, "may we get to share in your good will." PW. assigns to this category 10. 40. 3, *kásya dhvasrá bhavathas*, but it is clear that the genitive depends on *dhvasrá* as substantive (so S.), and this case is on a par with *asmákam avitá bhava*, 1. 187. 2, "become our helper," or *bhávā várūtham maghavan maghónām*, 7. 32. 7, "become the guard of the Maghavans," and such instances (the genitive being probably independent of *bhū*), which are unnecessary to take into consideration. In later Vedic style this construction of the genitive as a possessive became felt as an objective and "of him an hundred wives arose" is equivalent to "came to him." There is thus a distinction between dative and genitive after *bhū* which is unhistorically expressed in PW. as "mit gen. (selten dat. loc.) der Person." The RV. construction is prevaillingly dative (loc.), the later construction is

¹ Doubtful also (genit. or dat.) is the case of *vas* in 4. 36. 3, *tád vas . . devéṣu vibhvo abhavan mahitvanām*. So 4. 51. 4; *te*, 1. 162. 21; *me*, 10. 40. 5.

prevailingly genitive. Examples of the RV. dative usage may be found in my former article, p. 99; for the later genitival construction, compare, e. g., BAU. 3. 1. 1, Janakasya vijijñāsā babbhūva, kaḥ svid, etc., “a desire to know came to Janaka” (became of), and PW. s. bhū, col. 315.

Some doubtful cases of ásti may be settled by parallels. With dyúbhir hitó jarimá sú no astu, 10. 59. 4, compare dyúbhir asmā áhobhir vāmám astu, 10. 7. 4. With ásti hí te ‘gne devéšv ápyam, 1. 36. 12, cf. yáyor ásti prá naḥ sakhyám devéšv ádhy ápyam, 8. 10. 4, and ágne táva tyád ukthyám devéšv asty ápyam, 1. 105. 13 (similar forms in the same sort of clause in 7. 32. 19; 8. 27. 10). In such a case as 10. 100. 10, “body be medicine of body,” tanvò astu are not connected but tanvò . . bheṣajám. In samānám astu vo mánas, 10. 191. 4, the vas is to be compared with máma . . astu = me astu in 10. 128. 2 and 4. So vayám te (smasi) 8. 66. 13 is to be compared with smási . . eṣám, 1. 37. 15. Irrespective of ásti the word sám governs the dative, 10. 165. 1–4; 7. 35. 2, 3, 7 (sám astu tè hṛdé, 8. 17. 6; bháva naḥ . . sám hṛdé, 8. 79. 7), so that in such a case as 5. 11. 5, túbhye ‘dám agne mádhumattamañ vácas túbhyam manīṣá iyám astu sám hṛdé (cf. 5. 63. 1, tásmāi vṛṣtír mádhumat pinvate divás), the dative depends on two elements besides the adjective, the verb, and the noun sám, either one of which might have produced it.¹ Compare sutá índrāya . . kaláše akṣarat, madhumāñ astu vāyavé, 9. 63. 3; tébhyo bhadrá . . vo astu, 10. 62. 1 (in 10. 80. 2 the genit. is possessive); śiváh . . santu sám hṛdé, AV. 8. 7. 17. With bhadrá the dat. interchanges with the locative, 1. 113. 9 and 20, but in both cases there is the verb to reckon with also, devéṣu cakṛṣe bhadrám ápnas, ápna uśáso váhantī ‘jānāya . . bhadrám. So in 1. 1. 6, dāśúṣe is caused by kariṣyási as much as by bhadrám. On the other hand, in 7. 20. 10, vásvī sú te jaritré astu śáktis, “good to the singer be thy strength,” the dative depends more on the adj. than on the verb; cf. 6. 16. 25, vásvī te agne sámṛṣṭir iṣayaté mártya, without verb. In 1. 73. 10, ucāthāni . . jūṣṭāni santu mánase hṛdé ca, the dative “mind and heart” (equivalent to a personal form; cf. the same expression in 4. 77. 2)

¹ So in 1. 189. 2, bhāvā tokāya . . sám yós : 5. 47. 7, tát astu . . sám yór asmábhyam, etc. On the other hand, in 5. 74. 9, sám . . vām . . asmákam astu carkṛtis, is “our praise of you shall be weal.”

depends on *jūṣṭāni* rather more than on the verb. It is to be observed that *kar* has the same effect as *āvah*, "bring hither to," with an infinitive (interchanging in the same phrases) and that the infinitive itself is indistinguishable from a noun in various forms, e. g. *mārtān yajāthāya kṛṇvān*, "making men to (the) sacrifice," 10. 12. 1 (*ā devān yajāthāya vakṣi*, 3. 4. 1); *sā no jīvātave kṛdhi*, "make us to live," 10. 186. 2; *māhi nas kṛdhi saṁcākṣe bhujé asyāi* (inf. and noun), 1. 127. 11; *tād amitre-bhyo drśé kuru*, "this make to our foes to see," AV. 11. 9. 1. Cf. AV. 9. 2. 11, *urúm lokām akarān māhyam edhatúm . . māhyam śád urvīr ghṛtām ā vahantu*; AV. 10. 5. 50, "I hurl at him the bolt to head-splitting," *asmāi vājram prā harāmi . . śīr-ṣabhidyāya*, i. e. to split his head. While RV. has inf. *yudhāye*, 10. 84. 4, AV. has ptc. noun *yuddhāya*, 4. 31. 4, in the same clause, "sharpen the clans to (the) fight;" cf. AV. 5. 14. 9, "we sharpen thee not *vadhāya* (*ācakraṣe*), to killing" (RV. 1. 61. 13, inf. *yudhé* = AV. 4. 24. 7, noun, *yudhé*?). There seems to be no real difference between such datives and that in *jyótir yád āhne ākṛṇod u lokām*, 9. 92. 5, *urú kṣáyāya nas kṛdhi*, 8. 68. 12 = AV. 7. 26. 3.¹ One "cooks for (to) him" or "cooks for (to) releasing," *yām pácati riprān nír muktyāi*, AV. 12. 3. 5, just as one "comes to kill" or "comes to birth," *janúṣe*, or "comes to me."

The dative of the type *θαῦμα ιδέσθαι* may be filled out with another dative of the person, *māyaḥ pátibhyo jánayaḥ pariṣváje*, "wives, a pleasure to husbands to embrace," 10. 40. 10.² It is

¹ A good case of local dative after "bring, bear," is found in AV. 13. 1. 1, when, after *rāṣṭrām prā viśa*, "enter thy kingdom," follows *sā tvā rāṣṭráya sūbhṛtam bibhartu*, "may he bear thee, well borne, to thy kingdom" (not "to kingship": *prāviś* is local, enter a place, etc.).

² Cf. also in the verse cited, 9. 92. 5, *dāsyave kar abhíkam*, "made front (attack) against the foe" (dat.), literally a "turning toward," *abhí*, which thus comes as near to governing a dative as is possible.

³ The preceding *vāmām pitṛbhyo yá idām sameriré* may owe its dative to *sameriré* rather than to *vāmām*, which is never followed by the dative, except with the idea of coming or sending, as in 10. 7. 4, *asmāi . . vāmām astu* (cf. 6. 71. 6; 7. 78. 1; 8. 83. 4; 10. 42. 8). The datives in the preceding vs. 9 are worth noticing: *āsmāi rīyante nivané'va sín-dhavo 'smā āhne bhavati tát patitvanām*, "to him as into valleys run the rivers . . to him by day (cf. vs. 5, *bhūtām me āhne*) comes this marriage." Cf. p. 97 of my former article.

to be observed that the personal dative stands on a par with the infinitive, as in *svār dṛśé*, "a light to see," 1. 50. 5, and in *vápus . . cikitúse*, "a wonder to the wise," 6. 66. 1 (but *astu* follows). In 1. 23. 21 (where *tanvè máma* = *máhyam*), "supply a guard to me and long to see the sun," *jyók ca sūryam dṛśé*, the dative is really final.

Interchange with the locative, as after verbs "bestow," "put," etc. (illustrated in my former paper),¹ is found in *syāma várune ánāgās*, "may we be with (before) Varuṇa sinless," 7. 87. 7, as compared with *ánāgaso áditaye syāma*, "may we be to Aditi sinless," 1. 24. 15; *sádā tvé sumánasaḥ syāma*, 7. 4. 7, as compared (probably) with *asmé*, 10. 100. 4, and with *pratyāñ naḥ sumánā bhava*, 10. 141. 1. With "help," "good-will," etc., the locative is the normal construction, *ávasi syāma*, "may we be in (his) good will," etc., 5. 65. 5; 7. 18. 3; 8. 44. 24, etc.² It may be noticed here that *syāma* is joined with a ptc., *táranto víśvā duriṭá syāma*, "may we be crossing difficulties," 10. 31. 1, and so with the dat. *túbhyam deváya dásataḥ syāma*, "may we be serving (to) thee the god," 7. 14. 3 (so *té te deváya dásataḥ syāma*, 7. 17. 7; cf. 7. 37. 4, *vayám nú te dāśvānsaḥ syāma*), which depends partly on the ptc. and partly on the verb (cf. *túbhyam bhavema*, cited in my former paper).

2. Ūtí and other forms with bhū.

Like *ájagann ūtāye*, 1. 130. 9; *á cakrur agním ūtāye*, 3. 27. 6, is *bhāvā (ūtāye) ūtí*. It is a mistake (*Grundz.* iii. 192) to explain *ūtí* as conditioned by "the position at the end of the pāda." Compare 6. 24. 9, *sthā ū śū ūrdhvā útí áriṣaṇyan*, not final position, yet dative; as also 6. 29. 6; 7. 25. 1 (*á pátāti*); 8. 99. 7 (*itá ūtí*); 10. 15. 4; 10. 104. 4. To determine the case of *ūtí* some parallels may be given. I begin with 'call,' etc.

¹ Compare AV. 10. 7. 39, where *vímite* (loc.) seems to refer to *yásmāi* (dat.) in the same clause. Another example is found in the Pp. loc. reading *sūyāmā gṛhēṣu* for the dat. (vulgate) *suyāmā gṛhébhyas*, AV. 14. 2. 17.

² The interchange of acc. and dat. after compounds meaning "help, encourage," is to be noticed, e. g. *úpa-av* takes either dat. or acc. like "do good to" (below). "Conciliate to," caus. *sám-van*, AV. 6. 9. 3, takes indirect dat. object.

After "call (to)" three favorite datives are found in 1. 35. 1, *svastāye*, *āvase*,¹ *ūtāye*; *īndram ā huve ūtāye* . . *marūtaḥ sōmapītāye*, 1. 111. 4; *ūtāye vā sutapēyāya vā*, 4. 44. 3. The infinitive after "wish": *īndram uśmasī 'śtāye* and *brahmōtāye*, "we wish Indra to further (and) favor our prayer to aid (us)," 1. 129. 4; cf. *avatū'tāye nas*, 6. 9. 7. After "choose": "we mortal friends choose thee, a god, to aid" (us), 3. 9. 1; so 8. 6. 44; 8. 83. 1, *tād (āvas) ā vṛṇīmahe vayām* . . *asmābhyam ūtāye*, "choose that help to aid (to) us." So with "beg," *īlata ūtāye*, 7. 94. 5; "flow forth" to aid, 9. 66. 4. The "final dative" (purpose) is quite indistinguishable from the concrete dative here, one overlaps the other; "bring food to aid," 8. 60. 18; "come, bring food, to aid," 8. 1. 4; "drink to aid," "praise to aid," etc., 3. 37. 8; 14. 2; 4. 32. 2; 8. 5. 4; 21. 9. The double object (dat. or acc.) is common: "you get to aid (to) the singers," *babhūtha jaritṛbhyā ūtī*, 1. 178. 1; *na ūtāya ā yātaṁ sōmapītāye*, 4. 47. 3; *īndram ūtāye gus*, "came after help," 1. 104. 2; *tvā devām*, . . *ūtāye te 'vasa iyānāso*,² *amanmahi*, "coming after help and aid," 5. 22. 3 (5. 5. 5, "easy to approach to aid"). Ordinarily the god "gets to aid" the suppliant, as in 8. 68. 1, "we cause thee to turn hither toward (our) good like a war-car to help." So in 8. 88. 4. "turns thee to aid," 8. 92. 7, "drive (the god) hither to help."

Not "are" but "(we) work" is to be supplied in the phrase *yāthā ta ūtāye*, 5. 20. 4. The dative in 10. 126. 3, is influenced by *nāyīṣṭhā u na neśāṇi*, "best leaders in leading" (*āti dvēṣas* is only refrain). Or "come" may be supplied. At any rate, the simple "be" forms are rather carefully avoided, as not one stands after "be" alone out of the hundred odd cases of dative *ūtāye* (*ūtī*). Hence the dat. has local force. Half a dozen instances registered by Grassmann may be instrumental; *yuṣmākotī* . . *āgata*, etc.; in 10. 35. 13, *vīśva ūtī bhavantv agnāyas* followed by *āvasā gamantu*; 8. 97. 7, *bhāvā nas* . . *ūtī*, but cf. 10. 61. 27, *bhūtā devāso ūtāye* "(be) come to aid."

¹ The seven cases of *āvase* "to aid" in AV. are all after "call," e. g. *tā asmā āvase huve*, "I call those to aid him." This verb later takes acc. "call one," or loc., "call to bed," "to battle," etc.

² Compare *tūbhyam* . . *gīras* . . *iyānās*, "songs going to (after) thee," 10. 104. 1.

That the dative is used after *bhū* as it is after *āgam* can not be doubted. With “go” itself the claim that the dative represents reference even in the vernacular and epic Sk. (*vanāya gacchati* as “goes with a view to forest life”) is refuted by coördinate usage, e. g. in Mbh. 5. 72. 25, 34, *grāmāya . . vanāya . . nāsāya pravavrajus . . narakāyāi ’va gacchati*, and the fact that *pravraj* takes also acc. or loc. as well as dat. “forest.” Other verbs implying movement of the same sort are *vardh* (as illustrated in the preceding paper) and its radical cognate *ūrdhvā*, e. g., *śruṣṭāye devā ūrdhvās*, “the god erect (has raised himself for all) to hear,” 2. 38. 2, as in the preceding verse he “rises to arouse” the world. Generally the two notions are united, *ūrdhvās tiṣṭhā na ūtāye*, “stand up to help us,” 1. 30. 6; *yāsya tvām ūrdhvó adhvarāya tiṣṭhasi*, “whose rite thou standest erect to” (*aideṣṭi*), 8. 19. 10. The counterpart of this is “make erect” (*to*), both being combined in 1. 36. 13–14: “stand up (erect thyself) to help us; make us erect to act, to live”; compare *erectus ad agendum*.¹ Compounds of *sthā* are used in the same way: *yád . . samāsthithā yuddhāye śānsam āvide*, “when you arose to fight and get glory,” 10. 113. 3 (like “lead to fight,” *yád yuddhāye saṁnáyāni*, 10. 27. 2). One of the cases of final dative with *āsti* really depends on the same idea, *sthirá vaḥ santv āyudhā parānūde*, “your weapons be steady (stand) to strike aside,” 1. 39. 2; as the implication is found in *sthā* alone, *túbhye ’má bhúvanā kave mahimné soma tasthire*, “stand to you unto (for) greatness,” 9. 62. 27. Compare *atasthāno vā eṣa tasmāi yad*, “does not stand to (submit to) this, viz. that,” ŚB. 12. 5. 5. 2; *na dvitīyāya tasthus*, “they do not stand for another (god),” Śvet. Up. 3. 2, *id est*, they “stand for Rudra alone,” as we say, “I will stand to that.” So *ἐς τὴν στάσιν ἔσθημεν*, Hd. 9. 21; “stationed to” (for) *ἐς ἀρχήν*,

¹ Although *harṣ* (*horreo*) is used of bristling, the hairs standing erect in joy (Sk.) or horror (Latin), yet *harṣate* comes rather under the class of verbs meaning “be pleased,” followed by a dative infinitive, *harṣasva dātave*, etc., 8. 19. 29; 10. 112. 1 (cf. *jujoṣa*, 4. 24. 5). Also (*caus.*) “excite” *to*. Of these verbs, note that *mud* and *gardh*, “desire after,” take the loc., and that the later *tuṣ*, “pleased,” takes the genitive, the instrumental, and the locative (of person as well as of thing), and the acc. with *prati*, besides the dative.

3. 80; Latin *sententiae stare*.¹ The same notion² is conveyed by the (middle voice of the) verb *yam*, as in 9. 86. 30, *túbhya . . yemire*, "they hold themselves to thee"; 1. 135. 1, *túbhya-ñ hí . . devā devāya yemiré*, "to thee, the god, the gods hold themselves" (stand true), as the same form may mean "hold oneself to" in the meaning "offer," "yield," with dative, thus having the same construction with other verbs "yield." The stanza 5. 32. 10 reads:

ny āsmāi devī svādhītir jīhīta īndraya gātūr uśatī'va yeme
(sām yād ōjo yuvāte vīśvam ābhir) ānu svadhāvne kṣitāyo
namanta,

"withdraws (yields) to . . offers itself to . . bow to (Indra)." In 1. 37. 7, *nī vo yāmāya mānuṣo dadhrā ugrāya manyāve*, "man brings himself down to your course and mighty wrath" is followed by *jīhīta pārvato girīs*, "the mountain yields," both taking the same dative (as in 8. 20. 6).³ Something like *nīdhar* is *nīśad*, "sit down," used with locative, *nī duroṇé . . sasāda*, "sits down in the home" (of the fire as priest), 3. 1. 18; in causative, *vikṣū hótāraṃ ny āśādayanta*, "established (fire) among the clans as priest," 10. 7. 5; and causative with the dative, *tvā . . nī hótāraṃ sādayante dāmāya* "establish thee unto the house as priest," 3. 6. 3. With a personal object it is sometimes impossible to distinguish locative and dative, because the forms are identical as in Greek. Thus *Uśāne* is both locative and dative of the proper name *Uśānā*, 6. 20. 11, *uśāne kāvyāya* (dat.); 1. 51. 11, *uśāne kāvyé* (loc.).

¹ Another meaning of *sthā* alone is "stand at" (with dative) "wait for," as in 10. 109. 3, *nā dūtāya prahyē tastha eṣā*, "she did not stand (wait) to send (dat. inf.) a messenger;" 4. 54. 5, *tasthuḥ savāya*, "they wait for (stand unto) the command." Note that *ānuśthā* with dative, "obey (thy law)," 3. 30. 4, later yields to acc. and loc. "follow, help," acc. 1. 134. 1.

² Cf. "stand" with a final dative, "thou standest to the protection of steeds," *paripāṇāya tasthiṣe*, AV. 4. 9. 2.

³ The verb *nīdhar* takes another sort of dative in 6. 67. 4, since it is here "bring down," "establish," "make," followed by object and predicate adjective with a dative, like that after any other verb of similar meaning ("great, strong, the pair to mortal foe she made." *ripāve nīdīdhas*). *Dhar* itself takes a dative in the (middle) sense "be ready" as in AV. 6. 141. 1, *pōṣāya dhriyatām*, "stay fast to prosperity" (i. e. be ready in order to prosperity); ŚB. 11. 4. 3. 7, *dānāyā 'dhriyanta*, "were ready to give."

3. The gerundives hávya and ídya with the dative.

The gerundive hávya is found with an instrumental of the person as agent, 1. 101. 6; 7. 22. 7; 7. 38. 1; 10. 38. 4; with instr. of means, dhībhis, etc., 6. 18. 6; 8. 96. 20 (hávyaṃ huvema); with pers. gen., 6. 21. 1 (imá u tvā . . kārór hávyam . . hávyā havante) and 6. 22. 1; with matínām, 3. 5. 3 and 3. 49. 3; with the loc. 2. 23. 13; 5. 17. 4 (vikṣú prá śasyate); 5. 33. 5; 6. 45. 11; 6. 61. 12; 7. 30. 2; 7. 32. 24; 8. 20. 20; 8. 70. 8; 8. 71. 15 (vísvasu vikṣv āvitēva hávyas); absolutely, 1. 116. 6; 1. 129. 6; 2. 37. 2; 2. 39. 1; 8. 1. 28; 8. 15. 16 (sá stómyaḥ sá hávyah); 10. 6. 7; 10. 39. 1; 10. 89. 10; 10. 147. 2; in the following instances:

1. 100. 1, hávyo bhāveṣu . . no bhavatu . . úti;
1. 144. 3, ād im bhāgo ná hávyah sám asmād ā;
2. 24. 2. sá hávyah sá ídyaḥ . . yāmann á . . mártya . . várivo dhāt;
8. 90. 1, á nas . . hávya índraḥ samātsu bhūṣatu;
8. 96. 21, sadyó jajñānó hávyo babhūva, kṛṇvān apāñsi nāryā purūṇi sómo ná pītó hávyah sākhibhyas; and in 10. 39. 10, carkṛtyaṃ dadhatu bhāgaṃ ná nṛbhyo hávyam;
1. 33. 2, yá stotṛbhyo hávyo ásti yāman.

The last example shows that the dative is not even certain in the three cases in which it appears to be an agent-case; like asmāt, nṛbhyas may be ablative. But even granting that the other examples are really dātives, the fact that a "dative of agent" with hávya occurs only once each in books one and ten, against the normal construction illustrated above, shows that an agent-dative is probably not an early construction. In 8. 96. 21, the examples already given of kar with dative show that sākhibhyas depends at least on the verb as much as on the gerundive (see below). In 3. 62. 1. yuvāvate ná tújyā abhūvan, the dative depends on bhū, as it does in the other example cited by Delbrück, mánave śásyo bhūs, 1. 189. 7 (cf. . . purutrā hí vihávyo babhútha, 2. 18. 7).

But ídya with the dative demands more particular examination. A cognate gerundive is ilénya, e. g., didṛkṣényas . . jénya ilényo mahó árbhāya jivāse, 1. 146. 5, "worshipful to the small." None of the gerundives here is construed with the

dative as agent, and so in other instances, both of this form and of *īḍya*, e. g., *āgne mitró asi priyáh, sákhā sákhibhya, īḍyas*, 1. 75. 4, it is difficult to see why the dative should be necessarily taken as an agent, any more than when the locative is used in the same way, e. g., *ádhā hí vikṣv īḍyó 'si priyó no átithis*, 6. 2. 7 (compare *tvā vikṣv īḍyam*, 4. 7. 2; *ilényo vapuṣyò vibhāvā priyó viśám átithis*, 5. 1. 9). The adjective is as absolute as it is in 6. 1. 2, *ádhā hótā ny àsido yájīyān . . īḍyah sán*.

The fact is that *sákhā sákhibhyas* is a stereotyped phrase, which stands by itself, and the clause is not to be divided (as it is by Delbrück) *sákhibhya īḍyas*. In 1. 26. 3, *sákhā sákhye váreṇyas* no one takes the dative as agent. Compare 9. 104. 5, *sakhéva sákhye gātuvíttamo bhava (náryo rucé bhava, ib. 105. 5)*, where the dative is the same as in *asmábhyaṁ gātuvíttamo devébhyo mádhumattamas*, ib. 106. 6; but also 1. 53. 2, *ákāmakarśanaḥ sákhā sákhibhyas*, where the dative is not the object of the verbal, "not slighting desires, a friend to the friend." In other cases the dative is object not agent:

ā . . yajati . . sákhā sákhye váreṇyas, "friend gives to friend," 1. 26. 3.

sákhā sákhye apacat, "friend cooked for friend," 5. 29. 7.

sákheva sákhye . . prá ṇa áyur tārīs, "extend, as friend (extends) to friend, our life," 8. 48. 4.

pávasva jānáyann īṣo 'bhí víśvāni váryā, sákhā sákhibhya ūtāye, 9. 66. 4.

A comparison of this example with the next shows that *īḍya* is absolute in the latter as in the former:

pávasva víśvacarṣaṇe 'bhi víśvāni kávyā, sákhā sákhibhya īḍyas, 9. 66. 1.

The meaning is not here, any more than in vs. 4, "to be revered by friends," but, as in vs. 4, "flow forth pure . . as friend to the friend, to help," "flow forth pure . . as friend to the friend, worthy of worship." And this should determine the meaning in 1. 75. 4 (where Delbrück translates, "to be revered by friends") to be "thou art kind, dear, a friend to the friend, worthy of worship."

Other examples are: *sákhā sákhibhyo (nas) várivaḥ kṛṇotu*, 10. 42. 11, *yán me bráhma cakrá . . máhyaṁ sákhye sákhāyas*, "since to me the friend (as) friends ye made a hymn," 1. 165. 11.

This gives the norm for 8. 96. 21 (above),

kṛṇvānn āpāṃsi nāryā purūṇi
sómo ná pītó hávyaḥ sákhibhyas,

“doing for his friends noble deeds he is to be invoked like Soma.” Cf.

bhāvā no agne sumánā úpetāu
sákheva sákhye pitáreva sādhus,

“good as parents do thou become well-minded to us on thy approach, as friend to friend,” 3. 18. 1 (*sc.* becomes well-minded).

ná sá sákḥā yó ná dádāti sákhye,

“not he is friend who gives not to a friend,” 10. 117. 4.

In almost every instance, therefore, the “friend to friend” clause is construed as explained above. So *ídya* like *hávya* can hardly stand as an early example of a gerundive with the dative of agent, since there is only one example in which the dative in the *sákḥā sákhye* phrase does not depend on a verbal idea, and apart from this phrase *ídya* is always absolute, like most of the gerundives of its class. It occurs in phrases, *adhvaréṣv ídyas*, 3. 29. 7; 4. 7. 1; 5. 22. 1; 6. 49. 2 (*viśo-viṣa ídyam adhvaréṣu*), and *vajñéṣv ídyas*, 8. 11. 1; 10. 30. 8. The only cases where the dative is certain, against three with *nas* (1. 12. 3; 188. 3; 10. 100. 9); two (1. 1. 2; 3. 29. 2), with the instrumental (agent); and thirty absolute cases, are the two from books one and nine; although even they are more probably absolute than real examples of the dative of the agent. The dative of the agent arises from a wrong way of looking at the adjective (gerundive). It is not a syntactical phenomenon of the later period. It is supposed to arise and die out in the early poems, sporadically taking the place of the normal instrumental or genitive (with adjective).¹

¹ A companion-piece to the phrase “friend to friend” is “father to son.” A study of the occurrences shows that the dative is more or less stereotyped but like *loc.* and *genit.* depends for its character partly on real relationship with adjacent words. Thus just as we have *jāne sévas*, 1. 9. 4; *śévam mitráya*, 10. 113. 5; *aruśasya sévam*, 3. 7. 5; so we have *pitéva soma sūnāve suśévaḥ* (*sákḥava sákhye*), 8. 48. 4, “as father to son is kind.” Other examples are 1. 1. 9, *sá naḥ pitéva sūnāve* ‘*gne sūpāyanó bhava*. “as father to son (is) easy of access,” in which the *dat.* depends on the verbal notion. (Compare AV. 12. 3. 12, *pitéva putrán abhí sám svajasva nas*, “embrace us as a father his sons”; *ib.* 5. 14. 10,

This does not assume that the adnominal dative (which like the final is also Avestan) is not primitive. It is often identical with the final. Cf. *paridhír jīvanāya kām*, "a defence unto living," AV. 8. 2. 25. It occurs either with *ásti* or *bhū*. Compare both in 6. 45. 26, *gāūr asi vīra gavyaté, ásvo ásvāyaté bhava*, "thou art a cow to one seeking cows; become a horse to one seeking horses." But the stereotyped phrase (cf. Av. *cīm hakha haše baraiti*) is not a good illustration of the construction with *īdya*.

4. The syntactical construction of verbs of speaking in RV. and AV.

In Vedic-Sanskrit we have a perfectly normal development from the use of the dative with verbs of speaking as found in Greek, Latin, German, and Avestan. The accusative personal object is not primitive, except where speak is "call" or "name"; the dative of the object is primitive. The accusative after "call," the dative after "speak" (to), as in Avestan, is the starting point. But the (Latin) construction of accusative and infinitive with a verb of saying is primitive and may be filled out with a dative of the person addressed. Compare in Avestan, "I say to thee (dative) [that] the holy one (acc.) [is] to love (= to be loved; the infinitive as passive, *āfryēidyāi*) by (literally, "on the part of," abl.) the holy." Compare Hübschmann's *Casuslehre*, pp. 179, 217. The regular construction in Avestan is the dative of the person after a verb of speaking; the accusative is not an exception to this, since it occurs only when the verb means "call," "name," "declare," usually as a double accusative. The standing phrase "Ormuzd spoke to Zoroaster" (dative) shows the normal usage; the verb meaning speak (to) takes a dative just as verbs of screaming, lamenting, praising, greeting, regularly take the dative.

It is from this point of view that we should start. We shall find that in Vedic-Sanskrit the dative yields slowly to the accu-

putrá iva pitāraṃ gaccha, "go as son to father.") In 10. 25. 3, *pitēva sūnāve mṛdā no abhī cid vadhāt*, "be merciful to us as father to son," the last word is governed by the corresponding form of the verb, which governs the dative of the person (accus. of the thing) in the sense "excuse this unto," and is here united with *abhī*, just as *abhī-kṣam*, a verb of similar sense, takes the dative, nas . . *abhī kṣamadhvaṃ yūjyāya*, 2. 28. 3 (29. 2), or locative, *abhī no viró ārvaṭi kṣameta*, 2. 23. 1, or accus., *abhī nú mā cakṣamīthāḥ*, 2. 33. 7.

sative (later the normal Sk. case) as the general case of the person addressed.

(a): The simplest construction with a verb of speaking is verb and direct object, either as a clause embodying what is said or as an accusative. In the first instance nothing indicates a quotation; or an *íti* "so" shows that the words are cited: *śásvatī nārī . . āha bhójanam bibharsī*, "every woman says (proclaims) you bring enjoyment," 8. 1. 34 (no *íti*); *né'ndro astí 'ti néma u tva āha*, "Indra is not, so many a one proclaims," 8. 100. 3. The *íti* citation may be put into one clause and completed outside of it, *yá índrāya sunávāmé 'ty āha náre*, etc., 4. 25. 4 = 5. 37. 1 (without *náre*). Compare, *ná vocāma má sunoté 'ti sómam*, "we will not say 'do not press soma'," 2. 30. 7. The acc. is here impersonal: *kád yád ūcimá*, "what (is it) which we proclaimed?" 1. 161. 1; *satyám ūcus*, "they proclaimed sooth," 4. 33. 6; *yát kíṃ ca . . idám, vādāmi*, "whatsoever I proclaim here," 6. 47. 10; *vācam' . . citráṃ vadati*, "he proclaims (clamat) a clear word," 5. 63. 6; *yád ábravam prathamám*, "what first I said," 1. 108. 6; *satyám bravīmi*, "I speak sooth," 10. 117. 6; *ṛtám ít tá āhus*, "they speak right," 3. 4. 7.

This is a common construction with *vac*, *vad*, and *brū*; but the example of *ah* is unique in the Rig Veda (in not having a complementary personal dative). In AV., however, *ah* as "say" (= *brū* or *vac*, with acc. alone) is not uncommon; cf. *tád . . táthā 'ha*, AV. 3. 4. 5; *bahv idám . . ánṛtam āha púruṣas*, "much untruth here a man says," AV. 11. 44. 8; *tád agnír āha*, "Agni says this," AV. 8. 5. 5 = 19. 24. 8.

(b): An acc. of the person addressed stands after the verb of speaking. Here also a distinction must be made; *vad* in RV. takes no such acc. Although *ah* occurs many times with a predicate accusative it takes the acc. of address (= "speak to him," etc.) late and rarely (three or four times only); *vac* takes this accus. only in a couple of late passages; *brū* has the accusative of address only once outside the first and tenth books of RV. Discussion follows.

ah: The prevalent meaning is not "address" ("speak to") but "declare," "call," with accusatives as direct object and

¹ The cognate acc. with *vad* is (not *vādam* but) *vācam* or *°vākām* (e. g. 6. 59. 4, *joṣavākām vādatas*).

predicate. Just as one may say "they say this (is) true" so one may say "they say him seer" (i. e. declare him to be a seer), RV. 10. 107. 6, that is, the construction is identical with that of the impersonal object. This often has the appearance of "address," thus: *evá tám āhur utá śrṇve índra éko vibhaktá . .* (no *íti*), "thus they say (declare) him (and Indra is famed as only distributor)" etc., 7. 26. 4, where "address him thus" is inappropriate, as in many other examples freely so rendered. The following examples illustrate the faintness of the line dividing "call" and "say" (with predicate, as meaning of *ah*): *utá tvam sakhyé sthirápitam āhus*, "and many an one in friendship firm they say," i. e. "they say is firm" or "they declare many an one firm," 10. 71. 5. So 10. 112. 9, "they declare you most priestly" (or "say you are"); "whom do they declare hero" (or "say is hero"), etc., 10. 114. 9.

One acc. may be omitted; *pāpām āhur yás*, etc., "evil they declare (him) who," etc., 10. 10. 12; or the predicate may be expressed by a direct quotation: *yá im āhūḥ surabhír nír haré 'ti*, "who declare it (is) 'fragrant, take it out,'" 1. 162. 12.¹

As *tám evá ṛśim . . āhus*, 10. 107. 6; *yuvām íd āhur bhiśájā*, 10. 39. 3, mean "they call (declare) him a seer," "they call you physicians," and as in the example just given, an *íti* clause may be substituted, so *yó mā mógham yātudhāné 'ty áha*, 7. 104. 16, does not mean "who addresses me" but "who calls (proclaims) me a wizard" (or "says I am a wizard") and neither "address" nor "say about" is the true rendering. So in 10. 34. 4, *enam āhur ná jānīmo náyatā baddhām etám*, the construction is the same as in 9. 114. 1, *tám āhuḥ suprajá iti*, "they proclaim him with the words (i. e. say he is) 'possessed of children'," and the clause should be rendered "they say (proclaim him with the words) we do not know him." Similar is *uté 'm āhur nāi 'śó astí 'ty enam*, "and proclaim he is not," 2. 12. 5; *utái 'nam āhus . . asarat*, 4. 38. 9 (no *íti*). A general

¹ An apparent third accusative is syntactically an adverb, *kím*, in *kím aṅgá=nonne: kím aṅgá tvā maghavan bhojām āhus*, "do not they declare you generous," 10. 42. 3 (with the same construction following with *śru* "hear"); *kím aṅgá radhracódanam tvā 'hus*, "don't they declare you the helper of the wretched," 6. 44. 10; *kím aṅgá tvā'hur abhiśastipām nas*, "don't they declare you our protector from curses," 6. 52. 3 (on *nas*, see under *c*, below).

predicate may be added: *sātyām id vā u aśvinā yuvām āhur mayobhuvā*, "and sooth they proclaim you are joyous," 5. 73. 9, but this is adverbial.

The accusative of address is more nearly approximated in a few instances: *rājā cid yām bhāgam bhakṣī 'ty āha*, "whom even a king calls (addresses) with the words 'give a share'," 7. 41. 2; *tām ayām sóma āha tāvā 'hām asmi*, "him Soma calls (proclaims, addresses) with the words 'I am thine'," 5. 44. 14-15; *íti tvā devā imā āhur āida*, "so the gods call (address?) thee, Purūravas," 10. 95. 18; *yām mā sāvó mānuṣa āha*, "when Soma calls me" (? followed by *nirṇija idhak krṣe dāsam kṛtv-yaṁ háthāis*). Of these passages, those in 5. 44 and 10. 95 are referred by Arnold to C² and C¹ respectively and that of 7. 41 to B², only the last (doubtful) example being even as early as B¹. In other words, the accusative of address, with *ah*, if it be admitted at all, belongs not to the earlier but to the later part of RV.

vac: That *ah* has the meanings "say" and "call" is paralleled by the use of *vac* "speak" (*voco*, "call") in *áchā deván ūciṣe*, "you called gods hither," 3. 22. 3 (Ludwig, "hast her angesagt die götter"). Thence by way of the meaning "invoke," *vac* passes into the (later customary) construction of accusative of person addressed. The process may be illustrated by: "*Mighty*, with this word the voice of the singer praises thee . . we will laud thee . . so they have called (addressed?) thee," *íti tvā . . avocan*, 10. 115. 9. With this may be compared another late verse, 5. 2. 12, where *ítí 'mám agními amṛtā avocan* ("so they called this Agni") follows and precedes a laudatory injunction. It is surely not necessary here to render *avocan* as "spoke to," though the meaning hovers near it, as it does in 7. 28. 5, *vocémé 'd indram maghāvānam enam . . yád dādan nas*, "let us call Indra, the generous one, that he may give to us." Compare 1. 150. 1, *purú tvā dāśvān voce*, "I giving (much) call thee much," where the impersonal accusative is probably an adverb. In AV. 10. 1. 7, *yās tvō 'vāca parehí 'ti*, "who calls (or speaks to) you with the words 'get out,'" the later sense is fairly reached. As "call" may be equivalent to "name," the sense of RV. 10. 120. 9 = AV. 5. 2. 9. *āvocat svām tanvām indram evá*, may be either "called Indra as himself" (Ludwig) or "spoke of himself as Indra" (Whitney).

brū: Instances of accusative of address with brū are rare and found chiefly in the later books; *nāsatyāv abruvan devās*, “gods addressed *Aśvins*,” 10. 24. 5, *kád u bravas . . vícyā nñ*, 10. 10. 6 (doubtful). The accus. after a combination of word of speaking and transitive verb, 8. 48. 1, *vísve yám devá utá mártvyāso mádhu bruvānto abhí saṁcāranti*, does not belong here, the meaning being “to which gods and men calling it mead come together” (cf. *áthā ’bravīd vṛtrám índro haniṣyán*, “then Indra spoke about to kill *Vṛtra*,” 4. 18. 11). Another passage in the eighth book, 8. 92. 2, has *puruhūtám . . . sánaśrutam índra íti bravītana*; but here the row of accus. in the first half verse is a continuation of that in the preceding, which is governed by *abhí prá gāyata*, “(sing forth unto Indra the powerful) the much-invoked, him famed of old; call with the word Indra.” In 8. 45. 37, *kó nú . . sákhā sákhāyam abravīt* has the speech following and may mean “addressed,” but brū here is on the border-line between “speak to” and “invoke” and answers to the latter meaning in *ádhā cid va utá bruve*, 8. 83. 9, either “I call (= name) you so” (cf. *ád u bruvāte mithunāni nāma*, “name themselves”) or “invoke,” like *úpa bruve* in 8. 67. 10, *utá tvám . . úpa bruve*, “I invoke you,” (“invoke one to,” dat., 3. 37. 5), and so in 6. 56. 4, *yád adyá tvā . . brávāma . . tát sú no mánma sādha*, “what we invoke thee (for), that prayer accomplish thou” (cf. 1. 185. 11, *yád ihó ’pabruvé vām*, and AV. 5. 22. 11, *tát tvā . . úpa bruve*). Similar is *agním brūmas*, followed by a petition (“release us from anguish”) in AV. 11. 6. 1 ff.

Altogether in the Rig Veda instances of acc. after “address” are few and doubtful; some are distinctly late. Of the few, several have the meaning “call” rather than “speak to.” The combination of (a) and (b), that is “say something to someone” (both acc.), is a familiar type in Greek and in later Śk. (cf. *yan mām vadasi*, *Gītā*, 10. 14; *yac ca mām āha*, *Mbh.* 3. 92. 16, etc.); but in the Vedic language it is still a conspicuous solecism. One doubtful case may be found above in a late hymn—*kád u bravas . . nñ*, 10. 10. 6. There is no such construction with *vad* till Ait.Br. 3. 20, and that is unique, besides being, like the case above, a combination (*ity evāi ’nam etām vācam vadanta upātiṣṭhanta*) of a verb of speaking with a verb of approach, so that the accus. of the person depends rather

on upātiṣṭhanta, than, as Liebhich explains the passage (BB. 2. 275), on vadantas. There is a similar case in AV. 15. 11. 2. Here the later construction of acc. of address is gaining ground as compared with RV. and ity enam āha, "thus addresses him," is found in 11. 3. 28 ff., as in 15. 11. 3, yád enam āha, "when he addresses him" (the only cases in AV.); but in the latter passage the preceding verse has svayám enam abhyudétya brūyāt, where the accusative is introduced by the verb of motion and probably depends upon it quite as much as on the verb of speaking; although brū shows in AV. a marked advance on RV. and takes the acc. of address: bhúmim abravīt, "said to earth," 13. 1. 54; tám devá abruvan, "said gods to him," 15. 3. 1; mām abravīt, "said to me," 6. 82. 2, quite as in the Brāhmaṇas.

The double construction with vac may occur in RV. 10. 80. 7, agnīm mahám avocāma suvṛktīm, and as such is registered in the *Grundriss*, iii, p. 382; but it is quite doubtful, as will be seen by comparison with 2. 4. 1, huvé suvṛktīm . . agnīm; 3. 2. 3, mahám (agnīm), that is, mahám and suvṛktīm may be adjectives with agnīm. For tát vananti mā in AV. 12. 1. 58 there is an improbable v.l. vadanti. Sāyaṇa at 8. 77. 2 renders ād īm śavasy ābravīd āurṇavābhám ahīśuvam by "she addressed him (with the answer) 'Aurṇabhāva and Ahīśuva'" ("these two demons and their like you must overcome"), but īm as etam Indram (abravīt) is improbable (see note on this, p. 381).

(c): The accusative after a verb of speaking is often a predicate. The examples are too numerous to cite in detail (several have been given above), but typical are "what they (say, āhús) call fights that (is) illusion," 10. 54. 2; "they proclaim the sweet fruit on its top," āgre, i. e. say it is on its top, 1. 164. 22; "they proclaim (say there are) three connections of you in the sky"; 1. 163. 3; "don't they proclaim you the best comers" (kīm aṅgá vām . . gāmiṣṭhā 'hús, 1. 118. 3 = 3. 58. 3); "how do they proclaim (call) him generous to the singer" (kathāí 'nam āhuḥ pápurim jaritré), 4. 23. 3. All these (with ah) have predicate alone (jaritré depends probably on pápurim); but one example of it has a personal dative in addition to the predicate, táñ u me puṁsá āhus, "they say to me these (are) males," 1. 164. 16 (ib. 15, 19, 46, without me). This combination might indeed be suspected in the example given above (p. 376) kīm aṅgá tvā

'hur abhiśastipām nas, 6. 52. 3; but it is improbable, as it is improbable in tvām in me gópatim víśva āha, "everyone calls you my protector" (not "says to me"), 7. 18. 4, which is comparable rather with the genitive construction, tvām íd āhuḥ prāmatiṁ vaso máma, "they call you my guardian," 8. 19. 29. It occurs, however, once more in AV. 2. 2. 3, samudrá āsām sádanam me āhus.¹

The origin of the predicate construction is that of apposition, agnīm yamám mātariśvānam āhus, "they proclaim (it as) Agni, Yama," etc., after ékaṁ sád viprā bahudhá vadanti, "they declare manifoldly (adv. as pred.) that which is one"; 1. 164. 46, and as such the predicate is indifferently adjective or noun "people proclaim (call) him (tám . . jánā āhus) one well-endowed-with-straw," 1. 74. 5; "soma-lover they call thee," 1. 104. 9. From this to the predicate is but a step, "thence born they proclaim seer Vas." (they say seer Vas. was born thence), táto jātám řsim āhur Vasiřṭham, 7. 33. 13 (just like "they proclaim him seer.")

The predicate with vac also (as with ah) may take a supplementary dative. Thus, not only yásya víśvāni hástayor ūcūr vásūni ní dvitá, "in whose hands they proclaim all good things surely," 6. 45. 8; but also devó nas . . ánāgaso vocati sūryāya, "the god shall proclaim us sinless to the sun," 1. 123. 3 (as with prá, prá yé me pitáram . . rudráṁ vocanta, "proclaimed to me Rudra as father," 5. 52. 16)²; perhaps also in 8. 59. 5, ávocāma satyám tveřābhyām mahimānam indriyám, "we proclaimed as true (?) to the two mighty ones Indric greatness"; cf. řtám divé tát avocam pṛthivyá abhiśrāvāya prathamám sumedhás, "as right this I declared to heaven and earth to hear first," 1. 185. 10.

With vad the predicate is expressed by an íti in AV. 11. 1. 7, svargó loká íti yám vādanti, "which they declare as (say is) heaven" (in AV. 6. 61. 2-3, ahám satyám ánṛtaṁ yád vādāmi, is "what false I say is true").

¹ Other pred. constructions in AV. are like those in RV. : "they proclaim thee (to be) seed of the sea," 9. 1. 2; "whom they proclaim as a star," yám āhús tārakā . . íti, 5. 17. 4 (and so 11. 6. 7).

² With právac also dative but with direct quotation (of what is proclaimed) following, prá nú vocām cikítuse jánāya mǎ gām . . vadhiřṭa, "I proclaim to the thoughtful man 'do not kill a cow,'" 8. 101. 15.

With *brū* the predicate occurs in 1. 161. 13, "the goat declared the dog an awakener," *śvānam bastó bodhayitāram abravīt*.¹ The statement in 1. 23. 20 = 10. 9. 6, *apsū me sómo abravīd antār viśvāni bheṣajā*, "Soma told me all medicines (are) in water," shows again the personal dative after the accusative used as predicate (followed by *agnīm ca viśvāsambhuvam*, "and Agni (is) healing to all").

(d): When a thing is said to a person the person stands in the dative, *pitṛé . . ucyate vācas*, "to the father is said the word," 1. 114. 6. The meaning "declare" appears in *yó . . svāpne bhayām bhīrāve máhyam āha*, "if (a friend) has declared (spoken a word of) fear² to me the fearful," 2. 28. 10; *dīśa āhā viprechaté*, "he declared to (me) asking the directions," 9. 70. 9; and this may be rendered by "say," as with the impersonal object. Examples are numerous: *ayām me . . tād āha*, "this one has declared (or said) it to me," 10. 27. 18; *tād . . máhyam āhus*, "they said it to me," 1. 24. 12; *samānām in me kavāyās cid āhur*, "the same thing said even the seers to me" (the words said follow without *íti*), 7. 86. 3. With *prā-ah* the construction is the same, 4. 19. 10 (*ādhi-ah* is "bless," RV. 10. 173. 3; AV. 1. 16. 2, with dat.), *prā te pūrvāni kārāṇāni . . āha vidūṣe*, though Delbrück, SF. 5. 141, appears to recognize this construction only for the prose literature ("in P ist der Dativ bei *prā-ah* belegt.")³ So with *prā-vac*, "proclaim" (= "teach"), *āgni máhyam pré 'd u vocan manīśām*, "Agni proclaimed to me (taught me) wisdom," 4. 5. 3; also in a meaning

¹ With 8. 77. 2, *ād im śavasy ābravīd āurṇavābhām* (after the question, "who are strong and famous?") "then truly she proclaimed *Āurṇavābha*," compare the parallel, 8. 45. 5, *prāti tvā . . vadat* (words quoted, no *íti*); but it is wrong to assume for 77. 2 "addressed him," or a predicate, still less a double acc. pers. thing. As in 1. 144. 3, *ād im bhāgo ná hávyas*, *im* is a mere particle and the words are to be translated as above.

² Cf. the epic *abhayā vāk*. "fearless word," i. e. word of encouragement.

³ The combination *prāti-ah* takes acc. of person in RV. 8. 96. 19, *prātīd anyām āhus*, "said (what precedes) to each other" (as in Up.); of thing in AV. 18. 2. 37, *prāty etād āha*, "said this"; *prātibrū* "respond" (to, dat.), 4. 3. 8 (with acc. 1. 161. 3). The dative occurs after *prātivac* in RV. 8. 100. 5, *mānaś cin me hṛdā ā prāty avocat*, "my mind said to my heart" (cf. *tād ayām kéto hṛdā ā ví caṣṭe*, 1. 24. 12).

equivalent to "betray" and "appoint," 7. 1. 22 and 8. 27. 10 (*scil.* us to ill and good, respectively). So, too, *prá-brū* in AV. is declare = betray, i. e. "tell on," AV. 5. 22. 8, etc.; but in RV. *prá-brū* is "proclaim" (to, dat.), 4. 42. 7; and "bless" or "praise" ("speak for"), 1. 161. 12, *yáḥ prábravīt pró tásmā abravītana*. On *právac* with loc., see below.

Outside of compounds, *vac* itself is construed regularly with an acc. and dat., "we called (said) obeisance," *ávocāma námas* 5. 73. 10, "we (called) said a word to Agni," *ávocāma . . agnáye vácas*, 1. 78. 5; "we said a word to the seer," *ávocāma kaváye vácas*, 5. 1. 12; and so *yád vām . . ucátham ávocan*, 1. 182. 8; *kád rudráya vocéma*, 1. 43. 1. The acc. is etymological (cognate, *vac vácas*) or not, *etá te agna ucáthāni . . ávocāma*, 4. 2. 20; *mántram vocemā 'gnáye/ āré asmé ca śrṇvaté*, "let us call (say) a prayer to Agni who listens to us even afar," 1. 74. 1; *imám sv āsmāi hṛdá á sūtaṣṭam mántram vocema*, 2. 35. 2; *tád divé . . vocam*, 1. 129. 3; *námo divé vocam*, 1. 136. 6; *ávocāma námo asmāi*, 1. 114. 11; *suṣṭútīm . . vocéyam asmāi . . śrṇótu nas*, 10. 91. 13; *vocés (declare) tán nas . . yát te asmé*, 1. 165. 3.

Instead of a dative stands a personal locative, *túbhyam . . nivácanā . . áśaṅśiṣam*, 4. 3. 16; *ávocāma nivácanāny asmin*, 1. 189. 8; *prá rāmé vocam (sc. tát)*, 10. 93. 14. Doubtful is the locative in 5. 61. 18 (*íti* preceding), *utá me vocatād íti sūtásome ráthavītāu ná kámo ápa veti me*. The impersonal locative gives the subject of the conversation, generally a dispute (as later with *saṁvad*, *vivad*) *ví . . apsú . . ávocanta*, "disputed about water," 6. 31. 1; *tvám hy āṅgá varuṇa bráviṣi púnarmagheṣv avadyáni bhūri*, "speakest many reproaches about Indian givers," AV. 5. 11. 7.¹ Compare the use of the locative with *upālabh* in Ch. Up. 2. 22. 3, *taṁ yaḍi svareṣu 'pālabheta*, "if one

³ The construction of *vac* in AV. is as in RV. without object or with object, "declare birth of gods," AV. 2. 28. 2; 4. 1. 3; with acc. and loc. where (*pred.*) *ib.* 13. 1. 14; "what you say untrue," *ib.* 1. 10. 3; "speak truth," *ib.* 4. 9. 7; obj. with *íti*, *vārupé 'te yád ūcimá*, "if we said 'O Varuṇa,'" *ib.* 7. 83. 2; so 5. 17. 3; predicate, *mā mā vocann arādhāsam*, "declare me ungenerous," *ib.* 5. 11. 8 (18. 1. 36 = RV.); with dative, *asmāi vāpūṣy ávocāma*, *ib.* 5. 1. 9. In composition, *právac*, AV. 7. 2. 1; 2. 1. 2 (=RV. acc. dat.): *ádhivac* (as in RV.) is "advocate," "speak for us," AV. 6. 7. 2; no dat. with *úpavac*, 5. 8. 6, *nírvac*, 9. 8. 10 (*abl.*).

should take him up in regard to his vowels" (reproach him for his execrable pronunciation).

With vad, which as yet has no pers. acc., "speak to" may be expressed by dative (with acc.) or by ácha with acc.; the latter is 8. 21. 6; 10. 141. 1; with práti, á (abhí- vad does not occur in RV., but in AV. 9. 6. 4, as "greet"; in the epic, vada mām and vada mām abhi are equivalents and equal to Vedic práti vad; with sam, the instr. "self"). "Speak about" (later Sk. acc.) is expressed by loc. (see the last paragraph), 10. 109. 1 and 4, tè 'vadan prathamā brahmakilbiṣe . . devá etáśyām avadanta pūrve (AV. 5. 17. 1). The dative, always with accusative, has the force of práti in práti tvā . . vadat, "said to thee," 8. 45. 5 (with address following). Thus, śraddhivām te vadāmi, "I say a plausible thing to you," 10. 125. 4; nó 'pas-pījam vaḥ pitaro vadāmi, "I say no jest to you," 10. 88. 18; grāvabhyo vácam vadatā, "say a word to the stones," 10. 94. 1; óṣṭhāv iva mādhy āsné vādantā, "like lips speaking honey to the mouth," 2. 39. 6. The compounds do not add much to the sense, nas . . bhadram āvada, "hither-speak good to us," 2. 43. 2; adhaspadān me úd vadata, 10. 166. 5 (?). To these datives AV. vad adds "speak discord to the foe," 5. 21. 3; "let the wife speak a sweet word to the husband," 3. 30. 2; "one to the other speaking what is agreeable," anyó anyásmāi valgú vādantas, 3. 30. 5¹ (besides the same without dat., "I speak a sweet word" and "speak discord," with "foe" in loc. instead of dat.). In AV. pravād takes acc. dat., 4. 24. 3, yásmāi grāvāṇaḥ pravādanti nṛmṇām (RV. 10. 94. 1 comes near to this). The dative after vad is also used in AV. as a final, "speak unto not-giving," ádānāya (so with úd-vad, AV. 5. 20. 11).

The common construction with brū is acc. dat., tát vo devá abruvan, "the gods said this to you," 1. 161. 2; ád vām bravāma satyāny ukthā, 6. 67. 10; índrāya nūnām arcata/ukthāni ca bravītana 1. 84. 5; námas te bravāma, 2. 28. 8; bravāni te gīras, 6. 16. 16; bravīmi te vācas, 1. 84. 19; káḥ svit tát adyā no brūyāt, 10. 135. 5 (the doubtful forms belong here as datives). So in AV., ṛtūm no brūta, 8. 9. 17; gharmām no brūta, 4. 11. 5 (prá, 5. 11. 6). The compound ví-brū, "teach," is used in

¹ In RV. 10. 62. 4, vadati valgú vo grhé, the vas probably goes with grhé.

the same way, *vy ābravīd vayúnā mártyebhyas*, "taught to mortals wonderful things," 1. 145. 5, as in *prá-brū*, "proclaim," 1. 161. 12, etc.

(e): The personal dative without accusative does not differ from that with the accusative. Thus as we have "he declared (*āhus*) to me asking the directions" (above, p. 381), so we have "they declared (said) to me," *té ma āhus*, with the words said following (without *íti*), 5. 30. 2 and 5. 53. 3. As we have "declare that to us," *vocés tán nas* (above, p. 382) so we have *uvāca me várūṇas*, "Varuna declared to me," with words following (without *íti*), 7. 87. 4. As we have "who will say that to us," *tádno brūyāt* (above, p. 383), so we have *śṛṇvaté te bravīmi*, "I say to you," 10. 18. 1, what is said following (without *íti*). There is no essential difference between the verb with and without a direct object. So "how" and "what" (i. e. without or with an obj. acc.) occur indifferently with *brū*: *kathā mahé rudrīyāya bravāma*, *kád rāyé cikitūse bhāgāya*, "how shall I speak to . . what shall I say to," 5. 41. 11; *kathā mitráya . . . brávaḥ kád aryamné*, 4. 3. 5; *yád . . brávas . . mitráya . . satyám*, 7. 60. 1. Again in 1. 139. 7, *devébhyo bravasi* is "thou shalt say to the gods," with what is said following (without *íti*). In 9. 82. 4, *śṛṇuhí bravīmi te*, nothing particular is "told;" translate, "listen, I speak to thee." So *brávad yáthā . . sudāse*, "that he say to Sudās" (with speech following), 7. 64. 3; *yás cikéta sá bravitu nas* "who comprehends shall say to us," 5. 65. 1 (that is, say "whose songs the god accepts," as follows) are parallel to the later regular acc. with the words of the remark following, *tam uvāca . . iti*. Of course *brū* also has the meaning of *prábrū*, as in 5. 12. 5, *ṛjūyaté ṛjīnāni bruvántas*, "proclaiming evil to the pious." In AV. cf. 5. 11. 1, *kathám mahé āsurāyā 'bravī iha*, "how did you speak to the great spirit" (ib. 6, *prá* and *tát*), still keeps the dative of address which may be called the earlier Vedic type, as opposed to the acc. person (with or without acc. of thing said), which is typical of the later style. Thus verbs of speaking agree fully with verbs of motion in taking dative first and accusative later when meaning "speak to," "go to (ward)."

The force of the dative, moreover, may be measured by its interchange with *práti* and acc., just as with other verbs (as illus-

trated in my former paper). Thus *prāti tvā śavasī vadat*, "said the mighty one unto thee," 8. 45. 5 (followed by the speech without *íti*); *áthā śírah prāti vām . . vadat*, "said (spoke) the head unto you," 1. 119. 9; as in 1. 161. 2, *tád vo devā abruvan*, "said the gods to you."

As between accusative and dative used after verbs of speaking there is then, to sum up, a much greater variety in RV. than is found in the Brāhmaṇas. "Speak to" is expressed by the acc. rarely and in late passages; "say this to one" by double accusatives only as an exception. The usual construction is acc. of thing and dative of person or dative of person alone, with the words said given directly (with or without *íti*). This agrees with the radical meaning of the words; *vad* is "sound" (*clamo*, *clamor*), and so is used regularly of musical instruments (cf. *bhan* "sound," *bhaṇ*, "speak"), the latest verb to take the acc. of person; *vac* is "call, name," connected with *vox*, *voco*; *brū* (*mrū*), *murmur* (cf. *rap*, *lap*, "whisper," "talk," *loquor*), "sound," "speak" to, with dative; *ah* is "declaro" (*áhan*, the "clear," day; *áha*, "clearly"), just as *ácakṣ*, "explain" (make visible) becomes "say" with dat., and at last takes acc. of address (cf. *dico*, "point out," indicate; *diś* "point, show," like a verb of speaking in RV. 10. 92. 9, *stómam vo adyá rudráya . . námasā didiṣṭana*, "with obeisance show [declare] your praise to Rudra"; and *ādiṣṭam bhavati*, "is pointed out," "taught," Ch. Up. 3. 18. 1). So *bhā*, "appear," is connected with *bhās*, "speak," first in Brāh.

That a word used of any sort of noise should be used also of speech is not unparalleled (ŚB. 10. 6. 5. 4). Thus in 10. 33. 1, *duḥśásur āgād íti ghóṣa āsīt*, "'the evil one has come,' so was the sound" (=report). Cf. *bhan* (later with *prati*) in 4. 18. 6, 7. AV. appears to have *śaṁs* in the epic sense of "tell" (*śaṁsa me*, "tell me," Sk.) in 6. 45. 1, *kím áśastāni śaṁsasi*, "why do you tell untold things?" Sk. *śabditam* is "named."

(f): A few cases remain where (speak) "about" has been given as the meaning with acc. In AV. 12. 4. 22 and 42, *tām abravīt* is thus rendered. But here, as elsewhere, "about" is only idiomatic English for the original "declared or proclaimed

¹ Perhaps only "recite." Cf. RV. 4. 3. 3. *devāya śastīm . . śaṁsa* (4. 16. 2, *śaṁsāty ukthām*); Tāitt. Up. 1. 8. 1. *om śom íti śastrāṇi śaṁsanti*.

her," the explanatory words following; without *íti* in 22, but in 42, *tám abravīn nāradaś eśā vaśānām vaśātamé 'ti*, "Nārada proclaimed her with the words 'she is of cows the cowest.'" So in AV. 8. 10. 9, *tám devamanoṣyā abruvann iyām evā tād veda yād ubháya upajīvema . . íti*, "gods and men proclaimed her with the words 'she alone knows,'" etc. The only case where the object is not a whole person to be exploited by a phrase is AV. 9. 4. 12, *aṣṭhīvántāv abravīn mitró māmāi 'tāu kévalāv íti*, "Mitra proclaimed his knees with the words 'these (are) wholly mine.'" Of course these are the same as in RV. 4. 38. 9, *utāi 'nam āhuḥ samithé viyántaḥ párā dadhikrá asarat sahasráis*, "they proclaim him (with the words) 'he has won.'" In AV. 18. 4. 49, *yād vām abhibhá átro 'cús*, "what the portents (?) declared you (are)," instead of "said about you" is at least probable. Cf. "spoken the Jew" (=described), *Ivanhoe*, ch. 39.

The same thing holds in regard to the Brahmanic acc. "about," as in ŚB. 10. 3. 5. 15, *ya enam nirbruvantam brūyād aniruktām devatām niravocat . . íti*, "if one should proclaim him speaking distinctly with the words," etc.; 8. 1. 3. 5; ib. 6. 1. 16, *tam āha (brūyāt)*.

The effect of a "Greek accusative" is produced by this "about" rendering after verbs of speaking. Thus *tad āhus*, "as to this, they say" (literally "they say this" or as adv, "so they say"). But in the Brāhmaṇas this becomes stereotyped and we have (as in the Upaniṣads) *tad eṣa śloko bhavati*, "as to this (so) there is a verse," ŚB. 10. 5. 4. 16, etc. So without any verb, *tad eṣa ślokaś*, Ch. 3. 11. 1, etc.; cf. *yathāi 'vāi 'tad*, "as to this," AB. 7. 25; even, Māit. Up. 6. 10, *athendriyārthān pañca svāduni bhavanti*, "the five (organs of sense) arise *as to the objects of sense* (acc.) in experiencing sweetness," unless *bhū* here (as in the epic) governs the acc., "come to."

Contrasting sharply with the variety of the Rig Veda but, as shown above, continuing the later lines of the Atharva, the Brāhmaṇas present the uniform type (*tam ho 'vāca; tān ho 'vāca*, ŚB. 10. 5. 5. 1; 6. 1. 10, *tam no brūhi*, ŚB. 10. 6. 1. 3; Āit.Br. 7. 28; *agnim abravīt*, ŚB. 9. 2. 3. 49), which has given Delbrück the basis of his too sweeping rule to the effect that the regular Vedic construction is acc. of the person addressed (dative only

with acc.; “tell someone something,” etc. SF. 5. 141). This is Brahmanic. So in ŚB. 10. 3. 4. 3, *atha vāi no bhavān vakṣyati*, “you will tell us” (*sc.* it); 10. 4. 3. 7, *tebhyo vāi nas tvam eva tad brūhi yathā*, “do thou declare this to us, such as we are, how,” etc. Usually (*vac* or) *brū* is the word for “address,” not *ah*, though the latter occurs, *āha vāyum*, “spoke to wind,” ŚB. 10. 3. 5. 14. In ŚB. books 8 and 9, *āha* (*āhus*) are used only in the sense proclaimed (“spoke about”), but *abravīt* (*abruvan*) fourteen times as “address” (only once as “about”); *uvāca* only once as “addressed,” 9. 5. 1. 64 (yet four times in the book 10); *ācakṣ* (*tan me*), 11. 6. 1. 2 occurs first in Br. (then used later, as in Ch. 2. 1. 1). Here *prātiśru*, “answer,” takes either acc., 11. 4. 1. 3 (*cf.* Ch. 4. 5. 1), or dat., 1. 4. 1. 10. RV. has *mantray*; *āmantray*, “speak to,” ŚB. 11. 8. 4. 1, takes acc. as in Up. (below). The Br. shows also a new use of *adhī*, “teach” (instead of “learn”), “declare,” *adhīhi bhos tam agnim*, “teach that Agni, boss,” 10. 3. 3. 5 (*cf.* Ch. 7. 1. 1).¹ In *pratijñā* (AV. 19. 4. 4, with *vācam*, “approve the word”), *med.* as “answer,” there is also a new use, ŚB. 2. 5. 2. 20; Ch. 4. 1. 8 (later act. as “assert”). This field has been so thoroughly worked over and is so uniform (Liebich, BB. 2. 275, says that in AB. *brū* and its synonyms always have acc. of pers. as of thing) that there is little to add to what has already been said, except to point out the analogy between verbs of speaking and other verbs. Exactly as with a verb of speaking the direct personal object may take the place of the indirect, so with a verb of striking we have the personal acc. or the personal dative, and in both cases a personal genitive may sometimes (see below) take the place of the other two cases. Thus we have “shoot at” with dative or objective genitive, beginning with a combination of accusative and dative, “shoot a dart (acc.) at a person” (dat.), 1. 103. 3, or, what amounts to the same thing, at a person’s body, e. g. AV. 6. 90. 1, *yām te rudrā iṣum āśyad āṅgebhyo hṛdayāya ca*, “the dart which Rudra shot at thee (thy) limbs and heart”; AV. 4. 6. 4,

¹ With the radical idea of *adhī* “learn,” “go over,” *cf.* Ch. 7. 1. 3, *adhigā* as “study” (like later *adhigam*) used for the first time. Compounds *vyāhar*, *abhi°*, and *udāhar*, “cite, say,” occur thus first in Brāh. (see Up., below). *Vijñā*, know, teach, becomes in caus. “address.”

yás ta ásyat . . níravocamí ahám viśám, "I have exorcised (nírvac) the poison (from the dart of him) who shot at thee." So one may curse a person (acc., normal use) or perhaps curse at (dat.) a person, yád dudrôhitha śepiśé striyâi, "if thou hast harmed or cursed at a woman." Yet as "curse" regularly takes the acc., the dative idea may here be suggested primarily by *druh*, "injure," which takes dative (and later, acc., loc., or gen.)¹

The double accusative is now fully recognized, mâi 'tad brûtha, "you say this to me" (followed by what is said), ŚB. 2. 2. 2. 20, as is the dative after a verb of speaking ("bid"), "bid (the horse to) come," *etavâi brûyât*, etc.

5. The Dative in the Upanishads.

The dative of place, though not yet so common as in the epic, is well established. In my former paper, I have already cited BA. 4. 3. 19, "the bird bears itself to its nest," *sallayâyâi 'va dhriyate*, which is filled out with *evāyam puruṣa etasmā antāya dhāvati*, "hastens to that state," as ib. 16, *ā dravati buddhāntāya*. That the first case was felt as a place dative may be seen from the fact that the sentence is imitated in a later Up. with the acc., viz. *Brahma, 1, yāti svam ālayam*. To these may be added the similar "comes to" of Ch. 4. 1. 4 (*sam-i* with dat. = *abhi-sam-i* with acc.) and a case of the antithetical dative and ablative, BA. 4. 4, 6, *tasmāl lokāt punar eti asmāi lokāya karmaṇas*, "from that world (abl.) he goes back to this world (dat.) of action." Cf. ŚB. 12. 5. 2. 15, "may this (son) here be born out of thee, unto heaven," *ayaṁ tvad adhi jāyatām asāu svargāya lokāya* (on Jan "get to" see my former paper). In BAU. 6. 2. 13-14, *yadā mriyate/athāi 'nam agnaye haranti* means "when he dies then they bring him to the fire," a passage which marks the (Up. *ἀπ. λεγ.*) word *diṣṭam* as later in the par-

¹ In the middle voice, "curse," śap, takes regularly a dative of one to whom one is under a curse, literally, e. g., "I have cursed myself to him" just like "promised him." In citing the curse-word it is used like a verb of speaking "if we swear with the word" (*iti*), etc. In the sense "beseech," *obsecro*, the acc. pers. with the middle is regular, though in the epic the dative may take its place (unless the *te* in epic śape *te* is acc., as is very likely).

allel of Ch. 5. 9. 2, tam pretam [diṣṭam] ito 'gnaya eva haranti.¹ With compounds there is the usual number of cases, karmabhyaḥ pratidhīyate, "established unto deeds," Āit. 2. 4; tābhyo gām ānayāt, "led a cow to them," 1. 2. 2; but also tasmāi tṛṇam nidadhāu, "laid him down a straw," Kena 19; santatyāi (nourishes self), "for continuity" (of worlds), Āit. 2. 3; asambhedāya, "to keep apart" (with genit.), Ch. 8. 4. 1; na tam iha darśanāya labhate, "gets to see him," "him to see," ib. 3. 1; darśanāya cakṣus, "the eye is to see," ib. 12. 4; dat. poss. ib. 4. 3. 6, yas-māi vā etad annam; BA. 1. 2. 1, bhavati. As for dat. and acc., since "hasten (to)" does not mark the goal, we have dat. antāya (above) but antam gacchati, (acc.) when the goal is reached, BAU. 4. 1. 5 (4. 4. 3); and locative when an entrance into a person is meant, gacchanty asmin "go into him," opposed to abl. āgacchanti (asmāt) "come out of him," Māt. 6. 7. Compare "go" with dat. pers. tasmā enad gamayāmas, "we make this go to him," AV. 16. 6. 4 ("carry away to," dat. pers., ib. 3, 7, 11). The dat. in Brahma 1, svapnāya gacchati is not "goes to sleep" but "goes toward (the state of deep) sleep," as may be seen by the accompanying simile (of the creeping thing). In Sannyāsa 1, araṇye (loc.) gatvā is equivalent to an acc., "going to the wood" (not "going about in the wood,") as in 2, vanam gacchati. The same locative occurs in Piṇḍa 2, dehe gate pañcasu, though here it is rather 'among.' To "prepare for," aparasmāi dhārayasva, "prepare-yourself for another (question)," BAU. 3. 8. 5, has one of the construction of yogya "fitted for," which takes either the dat. (or loc. or gen.) in nominal form (or inf.) in epic Sk. Cf. dhar above, p. 370, note 3.

In BAU. 5. 12. 1, the dative is used after "do good" (to), in the collocation kim svid evāi' vaṁviduṣe sādhu kuryām, kim evā' smā asādhu kuryām, i. e. "is there any good I could do one (dat.) who has this knowledge, or any evil I could do him

¹ That diṣṭam anyway means the place is improbable. The dative follows "yield," tasmāi vijihite, "makes way to him," BA. 5. 10. 1; "able (to)," śaknoti grahaṇāya, "able to grasp," ib. 4. 5. 8; and in 6. 1. 7 interchanges with the locative of the subject of dispute, aham śreyase (Ś. dat.) vivadamānās, as against Ch. 5. 1. 6, loc. Instead of a place as object in 6. 2. 4, ājagāma yatra Jāibāler āsa, "he went where Jāibāl's (house) was." With vas "live," the personal loc. is "live with him," the dat. is "lived to" (served), Ch. 4. 2. 5, asmā uvāsa.

(dat.)? ” The dative is here like that in Kāuṣ. 2. 7. (5), yad ahorātrābhyāṃ pāpaṃ karoti, “what evil he does to day and night.” Compare the analogous construction, tasmāi . . arhām cakāra, “he did him honor,” Ch. 5. 3. 6; asmā arghyaṃ cakāra, BA. 6. 2. 4; trīṇy ātmane ‘kuruta, “three for himself he made,” BA. 1. 5. 1 and 3; namo vāyaṃ brahmiṣṭhāya kurmas, BA. 3. 1. 2; yajamānasyā’ tmaide ‘vadānanam karoti, Māit. 6. 33; pitrbhyaḥ śrāddhatarpaṇam kṛtvā, Sannyāsa 1. The locative is not used (Gītā 18. 68, bhaktim mayi parām kṛtvā, the locative is after “faith”).

After kar the genitive instead of the dative may be thought to be possessive rather than objective: BA. 6. 1. 13, tasyo me balim kuruta, “make oblation of (to) me as such (cf. just below, tasyo me kim annan); ib. 6. 4. 26, asya nāma karoti; Kaṭha, 1. 7, tasya śāntim kurvanti. In āyatanam naḥ prajānihi, Āit. 1. 2. 1; abhayaṃ kṛṇuhi viśvato nas, Mahānār. 20. 2, and tato no abhayaṃ kṛdhi, ib. 4, svasti no maghavā karotu, ib. 11; etāu me bahudhā prajāḥ kariṣyatas, Praś. 1. 4, the dative idea seems to interchange with the (poss.) genit. But the last two examples are certainly datives and probably the nas cases, because this verb has been so long used in purely dative construction. Thus in RV. there is little doubt that nas (kar) is usually dative, where asmābhyam, etc., interchanges. Cf. RV. kṛdhi vāriṣas with nas or asmābhyam; kṛdhi urú nas or śārdhāya; bhāgāṃ nas or rātnaṃ yajamānāya kṛdhi; svastí no kṛdhi or svastim asme karati; śām (kar) with nas or dat.; sugām (kar) with nas or gr̥ṇaté; akar te or túbhyam brahma, etc. That is, the doubtful form is by analogy syntactically dative. In AV. 7. 113. 1, yáthā kṛtádviṣṭá’so ‘múṣmāi, “that you may be having-done-what-is-hated-to-him” (?), the dat. seems to be of the same sort.

Instead of dative or genitive, Rāmop. 30 = 4. 3 (p. 501, Ānandāś. text) has stutiṃ cakruś ca jagataḥ patim, “they praise-did (i. e. praised) the lord of the world,” a periphrasis like a periph. pf., or “name-did” (with two acc. RV. 10. 49. 2, “they name-did me Indra”), or namaskuryāt pitṛn, Manu 3. 217. Namaskar itself takes dative or acc., tasmāi namaskṛtvā,

¹ On the form of question, cf. RV. 7. 55. 3, kím asmān duchunāyase; Tāitt. 2. 9. 1, kim ahaṃ sādhu nā ’karavam kim ahaṃ pāpaṃ akaravam; Kaṭha 1. 5, kiṃ svid Yamasya kartavyam.

Māit, 6. 29 ff.; 7. 10; namaskṛtya bhagavantam, Vāsud. 1; the latter being later, māṁ namaskuru, Gītā 9. 34; in loc. only epic; in disjunct. form only with dative, a (late) RV. use, 10. 34. 8; 68. 12; 85, 17. Either verb or noun (= verb) might have produced the dative.

The accusative (= "do to") is found only in Śiras 3, kīm nūnam asmān kṛṇavat arātis, but this is RV. 8. 48. 3; cf. kīm tvām cakāra, "what does he to thee," RV. 10. 86. 3; kīm mā karan, "what do to me," RV. 5. 30. 9; 5. 2. 3; and so kīm mā nindanti, "what blame they me," RV. 10. 48. 7. With "wrong" "sin," etc. the (double) accusative interchanges with locative: yās . . tvām āgāṁsi kṛṇavat, RV. 7. 88. 6; devān āgas, 1. 185. 8; mātān énas . . yāh karóti 7. 18. 18 ("do the gods a wrong," etc., double acc.); but locative of person in 10. 79. 6, kīm devēṣu tyāja énaś cakarthā'gne; and so loc. in 4. 54. 3, ácittī yác cakrmā dāívye jáne ("what sin commit upon the gods"). Doubtful is RV. 10. 29. 4, kád u dyumnám indra tvāvato nṛṇ káyā dhiyá karase kán no ágan (cf. sumnám íyaksantas tvāvato nṛṇ, 2. 20. 1). The kīm sentence also introduces a dat. (= serve), as in 3. 53. 14, kīm te kṛṇvanti, so 2. 29. 3. To "do for" (without obj. acc.), perhaps in 8. 46. 25, where vayām hí te cakrmā bhūri dāvāne may mean "we have done much for thee that thou mayst give," or "done for thee that thou mayst give much," or perhaps bhūri belongs with both clauses. This is the later kīm te karavāṇi or karomi, whereas in tava priyam kartum and priyam kin cin mayi kartum the case of the pronoun depends on the adjective "to do what is liked of me" (dear to me).

In construing manas kar, "make up your mind (to)" "set your mind (on)" with dat. or loc., the Up. is on a par with other Sk. literature; no examples are needed. As with tapas (above), so in Ch. 6. 16. 1, paraśum asmāi tapata, "heat him an axe."

With bhū (as with dā) the dative yields to the genitive, bhavati hā'sya svam, "the property becomes his," BA. 1. 3. 25 (possess. in nāma yad asya bhavati, ib. 1. 4. 1). The dative of price is represented, with an inversion, by a locative of that for which something is given (nimittasaptamī): sahasram etasyām vāci dadmas, "we give a thousand for (on account of) this speech," BAU. 2. 1. 1; Kāuṣ. 4. 1.

With verbs of hearing the construction is genitive (regularly) or ablative (Ch. 7. 1. 3) of the person (cf. Ch. 4. 9. 3, *śrutam hy eva me bhagavadṛṣebhyas*, "I have heard from men like you"). But in Ch. 7. 5. 2, *tasmā evo 'ta śusrūṣante*, there is a reversion to the old dative, "they desire to listen to him." In the same work, 7. 24. 1, *anyac chr̥ṇoti*, and 7. 13. 1, *nāi 'va te kaṁ cana śrūyus*, "hears another (thing)," and "would not hear another (person)," the accusative of the object heard is used whether impersonal or personal (the Comm. supplies *śabdām* "any sound," in the last example).

6. Verbs of Speaking in the Upanishads.

The usage of the Upanishads embraces inherited types. So we find as late as *Kaṇṭhaś*, 2 (3), *prajāpatim abruvan*, followed by *so 'bravīd brahmīṣṭhebhyaḥ*, "they addressed Prajāp." (acc.), "he spoke to them" (dat.). Ordinary usage may be illustrated by BA. 2. 1. 1, *sa ho 'vācā' jātaśatrum . . brahma te bravāṇi 'ti*, that is, the usual preterite is *uvāca*, the usual construction an accusative of the person addressed, but a dative of person if there is also an accusative of the impersonal object, "addressed him (acc.) 'I will tell thee (dat.) brahma'" (acc.). Neither second or third sg., nor second or third pl. of the pres. act. of *brū* are used; instead of which are found *āttha*, *āha*, —, *āhus*; *brūte* occurs in *Brahma* 1, and *bravāma*, *brūtam* occurs only with *pra-*. For *uvāca* are used *abravīt*, *avocat*, *avadat*, but not often (*āha* not uncommon as preterite).¹ The middle of *brū* is kept as such in the old Up., "call oneself," *Jābālo bravīthās*, "call thyself J.," Ch. 4. 4. 2; *bravīta* and *avocathās*, ib. 5. 3. 4; *brahmīṣṭho bravīta*, BA. 3. 1. 2. In *Kāuṣ.* 2. 3, *artham bruvīta*, "mention the thing," should be *brūyāt* (v. l.). The active voice is used in the same (med.) way in the epic, *Mbh.* 4. 19. 2, and perhaps this may be recognized in BA. 4. 1. 2, *yathā mātṛmān brūyāt*, "as one might say he had a mother"; in *Māit.* 7. 8, *ity evam bruvāṇas* follows a description! As in English, "say" is equal to "mean"; so *nā 'ham bravīmi*, "I don't mean" (that), without object, Ch. 7. 24. 2 (followed by *iti ho' vāca*); also BA. 2. 4. 13, *na moham bravīmi*, "I don't mean bewilderment"; so *bhaṇ*, e. g. *ṇa khu aham mahābhāam*

¹ Deussen's "sagen könnte" for (Ch. 5. 11. 5) *uvāca*, especially in view of 1. 10. 6; 4. 1. 5, is improbable.

bhaṇāmi. "I don't mean your honor," Śak. 3 (cf. Lat. hunc ais, "do you mean him"). The construction of verbs of saying is shared by those of thinking in the predicate use, jānāmy aham śevadhīm ity anityam, "what is called treasure I know is transient," Kāth. 2. 10; sadma (tam) manye, "I regard him as a seat (of wisdom)," ib. 2. 13; 6. 11. But the subject-object is acc., hataś cen manyate hatam (sc. ātmānam; BG. 2. 19, enam), ib. 2. 19; as well as nom., svayaṁ dhīrāḥ paṇḍitā (v. l. °am) manyamānās, ib. 2. 5; Muṇḍ. 1. 2. 8; amuṁ lokam jeṣ-yanto manyante, Ch. 8. 8. 5.

Before taking up the regular words of speaking, a few equivalents may be mentioned. Common as is udāhar in later Sk. (āhar as "speak" and, with "answer," "bring out a reply," is epic; in Up. only as "bring [to]," or "take to," Ch. 1. 2. 1, udgītham), it is comparatively rare here, followed by the regular dat. acc. as in Ch. 6. 4. 5, (no no 'dya) aśrutam udāharīṣyati, "cite us (dat.) an unheard of thing." It occurs only here with ind. obj. and in BA. 6. 2. 3, "recite" (pratīkas) with impers. object (AB. 7. 12. 7, "cite a Brāhmaṇa"); otherwise only in Māit. 6. 30 ff., atro' dāharanti, "here they cite" (vss. ff. without iti), as iti evaṁ hy āha in 26 introduces the same stanza (31); as "on dit" in Sūtra (AGS. 4. 6. 15, etc.). In the epic it even takes double acc. ("say a word to"). Another compound of the same root vyāharat (first in Brāh. as "speak"), in BA. 1. 4. 1. is "ejaculate" (anu°, Māit. 6. 6). Once or twice in the older works (as in Brāh.), Ch. 1. 3. 3, abhivyāhar (with vāc; Kāuṣ. 1. 6; Āit. 1. 3. 3, 11); cf. Ch. 8. 12. 4, abhyvyāhārāya vāk; cf. also vyācyam vyākaroti, "articulates speech," Āit. 3. 1; nāmarūpe (vyākar), Ch. 6. 3. 2; BA. 1. 4. 7, etc.

The acc. dat. is used (or acc. is to be supplied) with vyākhyā, as in BA. 2. 4. 4, vyākhyāsyāmi te (sc. etad), and so in 4. 5. 5; cf. also anuvyākhyāsyāmi (etat te bhūyas), Ch. 8. 9. 3 ff.; upavyākhyānam, Ch. 1. 1. 1; Māṇḍ. 1; ptc. as noun, BA. 2. 4. 10; Māit. 6. 32, (anu-) vyākhyānāni, "comments"; pratyākhyā in BA. 6. 2. 8, ko hi tvāi' vam bruvantam arhati pratyākhyātum, "who can refuse you."

With vi the meaning is dis- (dispute) in vivad,¹ and ex- (explain) in vivac (with dat.), BA. 3. 8. 5; 9. 26; Ch. 5. 1. 6;

¹ On Ch. 5. 1. 6 and BA. 6. 1. 7, see above, p. 389. For the locative, cf. Kāṭha 1. 29, yasminn idam vicikitsanti, "concerning which men are here in doubt."

3. 5; so vibrū is explain, BA. 3. 4. 2 (absol. with vyācaḥ and vyapadiś), with acc. dat. BA. 4. 5. 4. With uktvā, "saying," and prabrūte "proclaims" (nāma), āmantrito is "addressed," BA. 1. 4. 1 (2. 1. 15; perph. pf. as in Ch. 4. 4. 1 and Kāuṣ. 4. 19).¹ "Blame" for paripravocan (tvā), Ch. 4. 10. 2, is doubtful (in the epic 12. 132. 6, vac alone has this meaning, kas taṁ vā vaktum arhati). As for vac="teach," cf. the use after adhihi, "teach," in Ch. 7. 1. 1, "teach! I will teach (tell) you farther," adhīti . . . tatas ta ūrdhvam vakṣyāmi. "Repeat" (learn) is given by anu in anu-ah, "recite" (BA. 5. 14. 4; cf. 6. 3. 6),² anu-mantray (Kāuṣ. 2. 15 "calls after him," tam); BA. 6. 4. 5, with mantra; anuvac and anuvad, vedo . . . ananūktas, "not learned," BA. 1. 4. 15 (5. 2. 3, anuvad "repeat"); anubrūte, ib. 16; yat kiṁcānā 'nūktam, "whatever one has learned," ib. 1. 5. 17; anūcāna, "a learned man," not common,³ BA. 2. 1; Kāuṣ. 4. 1 (3. 2, anuvad, "repeat"); Ch. 6. 1. 2; anūcānātama, BA. 3. 1. 1; praśnam anubrūhi, "answer the question," Māit. 4. 5 (Veda-anuvacana, BA. 4. 4. 22); anūcya . . . anuśāsti, Tāitt. 1. 11. 1. The causative of anuvac, as "invite," with objective dative, anuvācayati somāya, etc., is not found here (as in Sūtras). The epic admits it with objective genit. and acc. "promise to a person a thing." Unusual words: kīrti is common but unique is the verb kīrtayet, Māit. 6. 29, dat. acc.; cf. upāyanakīrti, "acknowledgment of," BA. 6. 2. 7. Instead of "spoken" we find vāg uccarati, "a voice rises," BA. 4. 3. 5; cf. uccāritamātras (śabdas), Māit. 7. 11. "Talk," bhāṣ as in Kāuṣ. 2. 4, with sam, api vātād vā sambhāṣamāṇas tiṣṭhet, "let him stand to windward and converse" (later, epic, with acc.). On bhāṣ and lap (Māitri and Kṣur. alone have gad) see below.

The most general word for speak is vad; often used without object, e. g. "let the pair speak first," agre vadatām, Ch. 1. 8. 2; cf. vada, "speak," BA. 3. 9. 10 ff. So avadan (AV. ālapan) is a dumb man, BA. 4. 1. 2; yathā kaḍā avadanto vācā, "like

¹ Otherwise ā is not used with words of speaking (āhve, "call to oneself"); there is no āvad or āvac as in Vedic texts (on ālap. see below).

² "Some recite the Sāvitrī as an anuṣṭubh . . . one should recite it as a gāyatrī," S. anuṣṭubham anvāhus . . . gāyatrīm eva sāvitrīm anubrūyāt; ib. 6. 4. 14 ff. anubruvīta vedam.

³ Cf. Mbh. 3. 133. 12 and 9. 51. 50. yo'nūcānaḥ sa no mahān, pendent to the proverb na hāyanāis, as in 12. 324. 6.

the dumb not speaking with the voice," BA. 6. 1. 8. For this reason the combination vadati vācā is regular, and when speech is personified she uses *vad*; compare vācam vadanti and yena vāg abhyudyate, Kena 1 and 4 (abhivad, "address," ib. 17);¹ vācā vadan, Kāuṣ. 2. 14 and 3. 2; yat kalyāṇam vadati; BA. 1. 3. 2; and vadiṣyāmy evā 'ham iti vāk, "said speech, 'I will speak'," BA. 1. 5. 21. In Ch. 5. 3. 6 = BA. 6. 2. 5, vācam abhāṣathās, and vācam bhāṣitā, BA. 6. 4. 18; yāvad bhāṣate, "as long as he talks," Kāuṣ. 2. 5; priyam bhāṣase, BA. 2. 4. 4, there remains an old word not elsewhere used (till Gauda 4. 99 and Gītā). Another rare but old word is lap, used in causative, Ch. 4. 2. 5, alāpayiṣyathās, "make speak"; according to Ś., ālāp°.

As a general word of utterance, "pronounce," however, vac is used as in Ch. 2. 22. 5, sarve svarā ghoṣavanto balavanto vaktavyās, "all vowels are to be pronounced voiced and strong." "Called" is ucyate, Māitri 2. 6. So "count" (not gaṇ), yāvanto nividy ucyante, BA. 3. 9. 1; ākhyāyante (gaṇaśas), BA. 1. 4. 12.

Perhaps the distinction is best given at this period by vad = speak, vac = say. Thus "said elsewhere," and "said before" are anyatrāpy uktam, prāguktam, Māitri 2. 6; 3. 3; 6. 4 and 5; and 5. 2.

Spoken words are indicated by "iti" without verb, passim, or with vac added, ity uktvā, Ch. 2. 24. 10 ff.; tathe 'ti ha yajamāna uvāca, ib. 1. 11. 3; sometimes followed by a speech ending with another iti, as in Ch. 1. 11. 3, tathe 'ty atha . . . iti, "yes (said he), but, etc.," where the speech is resumed and then again marked as ended. So atho khalv āhus, BA. 4. 4. 5 (4. 3. 14) may register an objection, "but they say"; yet compare atho 'tāpy āhus, iti (and moreover), Ch. 2. 1. 3. 'No' said he, and 'yes' said he, are expressed by ne 'ti ho 'vāca and tathā or om ity uvāca (mā . . . iti "No!"), BA. 6. 2. 1, etc. But a quotation is more often given with a set phrase, as in Māitri 2. 2, ity evam by āha, "so he (one) says" (and so in ff. 4. 3; 4. 6; 6. 1. ff.); ity evāi 'tad āha, with ity abravīt,²

¹ But abhivac, abhyuktam, "declared," is used only in a phrase, tad etad ṛcā, BA. 4. 4. 23; Kāuṣ. 1. 6, ślokena; Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 10; Praś. 1. 7.

² Abravīt is gnomic here: asti brahme'ti brahmavidyāvid abravīt brahmadvāram idam ity evāi 'tad āha yas tapasā 'pahatapāpmā, "Brahma is, so says he that possesses brahma-knowledge; this is the brahma-door, so also he says, who is freed from evil through austerity" (Comm. etad as 'this'; but see below).

Māitri 4. 4; sa ha smā 'ha . . iti, BA. 5. 12. 1; and the formula iti ha smā 'ha followed by the name of the person quoted, Śāṇḍilyas, Ch. 3. 14. 4; Kāuṣītakis, Kāuṣ., 2. 1. 6; Pāṇḍya, 2. 2; Yājñavalkyas, BA. 1. 4. 3 (5. 1. 11). Another phrase is introduced by tad dha, as in tad dha smā 'ha Prātrdaḥ pitaram . . iti, BA. 5. 12. 1; tad (but Ś. tad as brahma here) dho 'cus . . iti, BA. 6. 1. 7; with uvāca, ity ho 'vāca, Ch. 1. 8. 3 ff., 5. 12. 1; BA. 5. 14. 8; Māitri, 2. 2; Kena 26; sa ho 'vāca . . iti, Kāuṣ. 1. 1; 4. 3; Ch. 1. 11. 2; 4. 3. 5; 4. 4. 4; 4. 10. 3 and 5; BA. 3. 1. 2; Kāth. 1. 4; te ho 'cus, ib. 5; uvāca . . iti Ch. 4. 4. 5.

The plural regularly indicates "they say" (on dit): tad āhus . . iti, BA. 3. 9. 9 (ity ācakṣate, ib.)¹; ekī-bhavati na vadatī 'ty āhus, BA. 4. 4. 2; tad (utā 'py) āhus . . iti (meaning by another iti), Ch. 2. 1. 2; 7. 11. 1; (ity) eva tad āhus, Ch. 2. 1. 2 and 3; tasmād āhus . . iti, ib. 3. 17. 5; with vadanti . . iti. Ch. 2. 24. 1, the subject is definite, brahmavādinās; but in Ch. 6. 4. 5, tad vidvāṃsa āhus; so Māitri 6. 7; "some say," ity eka āhus, BA. 5. 12. 1; ity u hāi 'ka āhus, BA. 1. 3. 27 (5. 12. 1); 1. 5. 15; tad dhāi 'ka āhus, Kāuṣ. 3. 2; Ch. 6. 2. 1; atrāi 'kā āhus . . iti, Māitri 6. 30. The optative having this indefinite subject is supplied by brū: yas . . brūyāt . . iti, Ch. 1. 8. 6; brūyāt . . iti, "let him say," Ch. 3. 16. 2 ff.

The construction of these verbs may be arranged as above, thus: they take (a) an impersonal acc.; (b) a personal acc.; (a)+(b); (c) a predicate acc.; (d) an impersonal acc. and personal dative; (e) a personal dative. Finally the acc. may be interpreted as the object not of address but of discussion (f) "about" which or whom something is said.

(a) impers. acc.: kim bravīmi, Ch. 6. 7. 2; tad bravītu Ch. 6. 1. 4; yām eva vācam abhāṣathās (tām eva me brūhi, ref. above); satyaṁ vadatī, Ch. 7. 17. 1; (artham) vadet, "tell the subject," Ch. 5. 11. 6; yad avocam . . iti . . ity eva tad avocam, "in saying this I said (meant) that," Ch. 3. 15. 5; iti sa yadā'ha . . ity evāi 'tad āha, "when he says . . he means," BA. 1. 3. 28.

(b) pers. acc.: putram āha . . iti, BA. 1. 5. 17; taṁ jāyo 'vāca . . iti, Ch. 1. 10. 7; 4. 10. 2 ff.; tam āha, Kāuṣ. 1. 6;

¹ This is found in Ch. 1. 3. 6, etc.; chiefly old Up.; tam . . indra ity ācakṣate (v. l. indram ity), BA. 4. 2. 2; Āit. 1. 3. 14; yad bhūtaṁ ca . . ity ācakṣate, BA. 3. 8. 3; Tāitt. 1. 3. 1, etc.; Kāuṣ. 2. 5 (4) and 15 (10); pratyācakṣ is "refuse," Tāitt. 3. 10. 1; Kāuṣ. 2. 1.

dīkṣitam āhuḥ satyaṁ vade 'ti, BA. 3. 9. 23; paśyantam āhus . . iti, BA. 4. 1. 4; vācam (pers.) ūcus, BA. 1. 3. 2; anyad vadet, "speak to that other," BA. 4. 3. 31; iti ha Kauṣītakiḥ putram uvāca, Ch. 1. 5. 2, 4; 1. 8. 3, 6; tam uvāca, sa ha tam uvāca . . iti, Ch. 1. 10. 2, 8 ff.; 4. 1. 5; 4. 1. 7; 4. 4. 4, 5; 5. 3. 1; 5. 3. 4; 6. 7. 3; iti mā bhagavān avocat, Ch. 1. 11. 4; usually in standing phrases, sā hāi 'nam uvāca . . iti, Ch. 4. 4. 2; tam ha pito 'vaca . . iti, ib. 6. 1. 1; tam ho 'vāca, Kāuṣ. 1. 3 ff.; Kena 25; tām ho 'vāca . . iti, Ch. 1. 12. 3; 5. 1. 7; 11. 4 and 7; Māitri 2. 3; 4. 1, etc.; BA. 3. 1. 2; atha ho 'vāca Satyayajñam . . iti, Ch. 5. 13. 1 ff.; tām ha Prajāpatir uvāca kim . . iti, Ch. 8. 7. 3 ff.; atha hāi nam . . uvāca . . iti . . iti ho 'vāca, "he addressed him and said," Ch. 1. 11. 1. With iti may go tad etc. as in tad dha smā 'ha . . pitaram . . iti, BA. 5. 12. 1, where the pronoun may be adverbial or bring the clause under (a) + (b), below.

The clause above, tām ha Prajāpatir uvāca kim, etc., Ch. 8. 7. 3, implies "ask," and this is not a rare connotation, cf. āhus in Ch. 8. 6. 4. The accusative also occurs in a good many cases after a combination of verbs of speaking and transitive (motion) verbs as in Kāuṣ. 4. 1, Ajātaśatrum etyo 'vāca . . iti; Ch. 1. 12. 2, tam . . upasametyo 'cus . . iti; and so ib. 3; 4. 4. 3; 5. 1. 7, pitaram etyo 'cus; ib. 12; cf. tam ho 'vācā 'nanuśiṣya vāva kila mā bhagavān abravīd anu tvā 'śiṣam iti, "he addressed him (saying) 'without indeed instructing me spake (addressed?) my lord (saying) I have instructed thee'," Ch. 5. 3. 4 (see note).¹

I have been at pains to give the many examples of this construction with other verbs in order to show its comparative rarity with brū. This marks the later epic style sharply from that of the Upaniṣads and is one of the countless minor points

¹ This verb anuśās, "teach," Ch. 4. 2. 2, takes dat. and acc. in anu ma etām devatām sādhi; obj. acc. in Kena 3 (tad); pers. acc. BA. 1. 5. 17, etc.; Tāitt. 1. 11. 1; Ch. 4. 2. 4; 4. 9. 2, etc. In Māitri 4. 1. anuśādhi tvam (asmākam! so Comm.) the words gatiḥ anyā na vidyate follow, and it is rather harsh to connect asmākam with this clause; but see below. As there is always elsewhere an obj. pers. or impers. mā (above) would seem to be governed by ananuśiṣya. There is no case of double acc. with this verb (as in epic). The meaning teach may also be given by adhi-i, as in Tāitt. 3. 3. 1. by vijñāpaya, with two acc. (epic gen. as 'say' to), Ch. 6. 5. 4 (pers. acc. alone in phrase of Kāuṣ. 1. 1, etc.); Kāuṣ. 3. 1. etc.

always emerging to correct unhistorical bias in regard to the age of the epic.

With the optative, in Ch. 2. 22. 3, *sa tvā prativakṣyati* 'ty enam brūyāt; *nāi* 'vāi 'nam brūyus *pitṛhā* 'sī 'ti, ib. 7. 15. 3 (answers to *evāi* 'nam āhus, ib. 2, "say to him"); *taṁ ced brūyus* . . iti ("if they should say to him" . . " followed by *sa brūyāt* . . iti); ib. 7. 15. 4; 8. 1. 1 ff.

As a preterite, enam *abruvan* . . iti, *Āit.* 1. 2. 1; *tā abravīt*, *Āit.* 1. 2. 3 (5, *abrūtām*); *athāi* 'nam *abrūma* . . iti, *BA.* 3. 3. 1; so 'bravīt *Patañcalaṁ kāpyaṁ yājñikāṁś ca* . . iti, *BA.* 3. 7. 1 (three times); *iti rājānam abravīt*, *Māitri* 1. 2; *prajāpatim abruvan* (*taṁ ho* 'vāca), ib. 2. 1 and 3; *tam abravīt*, *Kaṭha* 1. 16 (no iti); and combined with a verb of instructing, Ch. 5. 3. 4 (above).

These few cases should be compared with the multitude of pers. acc. after *ah*, *vac*, of the Upaniṣads and with the regular *mām*, *tam*, etc. *abravīt* of the epic, where it has become a formula. It is the more surprising since the preterite of *brū* without pers. acc. is common enough in Up.

Unique is *vad* with person. acc. In Ch. 5. 3. 7, *yathā mā tvam avadas*, "since you have addressed me" (the construction belongs to a later period).¹ It is not in the *BA.* 6. 2. 8 parallel.

In *BA.* 5. 14. 8, *etad dha vāi tad Janako Vāideho Buḍilam Āśvatarāśvim uvāca* (*yan nu ho tadgāyatrivid abrūthā atha katham hastī bhūto vahasī* 'ti), there is a combination of the impersonal and personal accusative which, however, may be no more than a combination of the impers. as adv. with the person. acc.: "J. spake thus to V.," or "this following said J. to V." The Comm. takes *tat* as *tatra*, "in this regard." Compare the usual phrase *tad dhāi* 'tad in (d) below. This combination of (a) and (b) is common enough later, but rare in the Upaniṣads. In so late a thing as *Piṇḍa* 1. 1, *brahmāṇam idam abruvan* there is a parallel to *yan mām vadasi*, *Gītā* 10. 14; but earlier Up.

¹ PW. gives no examples earlier than the epic for *vad*, "address," with pers. acc.; but see below for a doubtful case in Ch. Of course *abhiavad* in this sense is common *BA.*, Ch., *Kena*, etc.; also as "speak about," *abhyūde*, Ch. 4. 14. 2; *samudire*, "spoke among themselves," ib. 4. 10. 4. (see below); *vivad*, "dispute," locative, Ch. 5. 1. 6, etc.; *ati*°, ib. 7. 16. 1 (*Māitri* 4. 5, *ativādy asi*); *anu*°, *Kāuṣ.* 3. 2; *BA.* 5. 2. 3; *prati*°, *Kaṭha* 1. 15 (above).

scarcely recognize the construction. Just as above we have vad uniquely with pers., so the earliest case here is with vad, yathā mā tvam tadāi 'tān avadas, Ch. 5. 3. 5. But to understand this clause it must be observed that with etān the word praśnān "questions" is to be supplied, and the construction may be that of a verb of asking, "as thou hast (said) asked me these (questions)," as just before this stands pañca mā praśnān aprākṣīt, "he asked me five questions," with the (regular) double acc. The passage seems to be incomplete (so Deussen); in form it is like that of 5. 3. 7 (above, yathā mā tvam avado yathā). Another passage in Chānd. also presents a difficulty like that of the combination-construction spoken of above: 5. 11. 7, tān ho 'vāca prātar vaḥ prativaktā 'smi 'ti . . tān hā 'nupaniyāi 'vāi 'tad uvāca, "he addressed them (saying) 'I will reply to you in the morning . . thus [this] even without initiating them he said." Here the personal acc. is induced primarily by the gerund and etad is adverb rather than object (i. e. "without initiating them he spoke as follows"). Compare below (d) the note on prati-compounds.

It is a mark of the lateness of Māitri¹ that the personal object in this class of verbs is found in the genitive, tad asmākam brūhi (cf. anuśādhi asmākam, above, but the latter is doubtful), 2. 3, preceded by vidyā . . asmākam bhagavatā Māitrinā 'khyātā 'haṁ te kathayiṣyāmi. So in 4. 5, śreyaḥ katamo yaḥ so 'smākam brūhi, "tell us which is the better part (not with Max Müller "which is best for us"). Also in 7. 10, eteṣām uktam, "declared to." In 1. 2. (sc. ātmatattvam), no (=asmabhyam acc. to Rāmat.) brūhi, may be genitive (the genit. in BA. 6. 2. 6, mānuṣāṇām brūhi, is partitive). In Śvet. 6. 23 (also a late Up.) tasyāi 'te kathitā hy arthāḥ prakāśante mahātmanas, the genitive may depend on kath (as above in Māitri), especially since prakāś (a common verb) takes no such (Up.) objective case. Later Sk., though retaining the dative as well, uses this genit. construction; doubtful are me, te, Gītā 10. 19, hanta te

¹ Cf. also the late vocabulary; sūcay, "describe," 3. 1; uśanti=opine, 2. 7; bhūtātman, tanmātra, mahābhūta, 3. 2; cakravartir, 1. 4; tatstha, 6. 10. 16; mātṛka, 7. 11. These words are all late (cf. my *Great Epic*, p. 33 ff.); cf. also gad, which, as nigad, occurs in Sūtras (in Mbh. 8. 83. 29 it takes double acc.), and once in Kṣur. Up. 10, otherwise only in Māitri 1. 2, gāthām jagāda. Cf. also naṭa, raṅga, etc. in Māitri 7. 8.

kathayīṣyāmi, etc. In Kena 32, uktā ta upaniṣad . . ta upaniṣad-am abrūma, the te is probably dative (as below).¹

The predicate acc. (c) is not often found but is represented (both adj. and noun) sufficiently in the older Up., no bhavān purā'nuṣiṣṭān avocat, "you said I was instructed," B.A. 6. 2. 3 (so ib. 1. 5. 17, putram . . lokyam āhus); the periphrasis with iti, āhur darsapūrṇamāsāv iti, "they assert the new- and full-moon sacrifices" (to be intended), ib. 1. 5. 2. Cf. °manoyuktam bhakte'ty āhus, Kaṭha 3. 4 (3. 1, vadanti with pred. acc.). In Ch. mahāntam aśya mahimānam āhus, "great they say is the greatness of him," 4. 3. 7; cf. yan na suvijñeyam āttha, Kaṭha 1. 22; indriyāṇi hayān āhus, ib. 3. 4; 6. 10; yenā 'hur mano matam, "whereby they say thought is thought," Kena 5; tam āhur agryam puruṣam mahāntam, Śvet. 3. 19. Compare also B.A. 4. 4. 9, tasmin . . nīlam āhus, "on it they say is dark-blue."

As predicate with vac, "teach," prānaṁ ca hā 'smāi tad ākāśaṁ co 'eus, "they taught him (declared to him) that (Brahma) as breath and space," Ch. 4. 10. 5 (after asmāi prabravāma, "let us teach him").

With vad, Tāitt. 1. 1. 1, tvām eva brahma vadiṣyāmi, "I will declare thee as Brahma," only here and ff. (1. 12. 1), till the later Up.

After a verb of perception it is noticeable that the nom. in a simile may stand in agreement with the obj. accus.: tā asme 'va . . sthānur iva tiṣṭhamānā apaśyat, "he saw them (acc.) standing (acc.) like a stone (nom.), like a post (nom.)," Māitri 2. 6; cf. with kar, ibid., sa vāyur ivā 'tmānaṁ kṛtvā, "making himself (acc.) like wind (nom.)."

The impersonal acc. and personal dative (d). The construction is too common to require a heap of instances; it will suffice to show how contiguous, almost inseparable in Sk. are the shades of meaning in "speak," "proclaim," "teach," as rendered in English; to illustrate the usual phraseology; and to interpret doubtful by means of certain examples. The points can be taken together.

tam (udgītham) . . Udaraśāṇḍilyāyo 'ktvo 'vāca. . . iti, "on declaring (teaching) this to U. he said. . .," Ch. 1. 9. 3; tad dhāi 'tad . . Kṛṣṇāyo 'ktvo 'vāca . . iti, Ch. 3. 17. 6 (here the

¹ Epic construction with acc. has dat. e. g. kathayāmāsa Śatrughnāya kathās, R. 7. 71. 5.

pronoun refers to the view just explained); tad dhāi 'tad Brahmā Prajāpataya uvāca . . putrāya pitā . . provāca . . tat putrāya . . prabrūyāt, Ch. 3. 11. 4-5; tad dhāi 'tat Satyakāmo Jābālo Gośrutaye . . uktvo 'vāca yady apy enac chuṣkāya sthāṇave brūyāt . . iti, Ch. 5. 2. 3. Here the same construction is used with the verb of speaking and that of proclaiming or teaching, viz. the dative of the person, and this is the case in brahma me vakṣyati, BA. 2. 1. 15, as *ib.* 2. 5. 16, idam vai tan madhu . . Aśvibhyām uvāca. So tat tubhyam avocan, BA. 6. 2. 4; tām vidyām tubhyam vakṣyāmi, *ib.* 8 (cf. *ib.* 6. 3. 7). Hence in te 'haṁ tad vakṣyāmi, BA. 4. 2. 1; tad eva me brūhi, *ib.* 2. 4. 3; tāu (praśnāu) me brūhi, *ib.* 3. 8. 2 ("tell i. e.: answer me these questions"; but in 1, "I will ask him two questions, double acc. with prakṣyāmi, followed by tāu cen me vakṣyati); yat te kaścid abravīt, *ib.* 4. 1. 2; brahmaṇas ca te pādāṁ bravāṇī 'ti bravītu me bhagavān iti tasmāi ho 'vāca . . agniṣ te pādāṁ vakte 'ti, etc., Ch. 4. 5. 2-6. 1 ff.; bhagavāns tv eva me kāme brūyāt, Ch. 4. 9. 2; tan me bhagavān bravītu, Ch. 7. 1. 5 ff.; tam eva no brūhi, Ch. 5. 11. 6; uktā ta upaniṣad, Kena 32; the same dative is to be assumed as follows prabrū, e. g., prabrūhy asmā iti tasmāi hā 'procyāi 'va, Ch. 4. 10. 2. Cf. brahma te bravāṇi, Kāuṣ. 4. 1; tat te bravāṇi, Kāṭha 2. 15 (tām uvāca tasmāi, Kāṭha 1. 15, tam uvācā 'ṅgire, Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 2). So also with a verb of explaining, tam me vyācakṣva, BA. 3. 4. 1; (etad) vyākhyāsyāmi te, vyācakṣāṇasya tu me nididhyāsasva, BA. 2. 4. 4 = 4. 5. 5; ye nas tad vyācacakṣire, Kena 3 (vica-cakṣire, Īś. 10, 13); tam cen me na vivakṣyasi, BA. 3. 9. 26. The construction is just that of giving something to one; cf. the parallel in Māitri 6. 29, etad guhyatamam . . nā'sāntāya kīrtayet . . sarvagūṇasampannāya dadyāt.

So also pratipad "declare," which occurs with vācam as early as RV., takes acc. and dat.; prakṣyanti mām . . tebhyo na sarvam iva pratipatsye, "they will question me and I shall very likely not declare to (answer) them everything." Ch. 5. 11. 3 (acc. without dat. *ib.* 6. 7. 4).¹

¹ In BA. 1. 4. 8, pratipede is "declared" (no pers. obj.), but *ib.* 3. 8. 1, as in Ch. 4. 9. 2, it is "replied" (to a question). Usually in speech-words prati takes an acc. pers., as in Ch. aprccham mātaram sā mā pratyabravīt, "I asked mother, she answered me" (as follows), Ch. 4. 4. 4; tam u ha paraḥ pratyuvāca, "and the other answered him," Ch. 4. 1. 3 and

(e) personal dative without non-personal accusative. Here it is not always clear whether the word means "declare (this to)" or simply "speak (to)." In many cases the *iti* following or the object to be supplied suggests that the former is the proper meaning, as also when the passive form implies "addressed" as "instructed" (te . . tatho'ktasya mayā, "of thee thus instructed by me," Ch. 1. 11. 5). Thus in Ch. 4. 5. 2; 6. 3 ff., te pādām bravāṇī'ti, bravītu me bhagavān *iti*, tasmāi ho 'vāca . . *iti* (with a paragraph of instruction before *iti*), it is evident that bravītu = pra° and uvāca is "declared (it) to him." Similar is the tasmāi ho 'vāca in 4. 2. 5, although no *iti* follows (agniṣ te pādām vaktā, 4. 6. 1, etc., shows the object). Compare ib. 4. 10. 4, atha hā 'gnayaḥ samudire . . hantā 'smāi praḥravāme 'ti, tasmāi ho 'cus . . *iti*; 4. 14. 1-3, te ho 'cus . . ācāryās tu te gatiṁ vakte 'ti . . kim . . te 'vocaṁ . . ahaṁ tu tad vakṣyāmi . . bravītu me . . tasmāi ho 'vāca, although no *iti* follows the final word, and uvāca may here be rendered "he spoke to him" or "he declared it to him." But it is safe to assume that the dative regularly implies an accompanying accusative, as in katham te nā' vakṣyam (cf. tasmāi hā 'procyā, 4. 10. 2, "not teaching him"), "why shouldn't I have told (taught) you," 5. 3. 5, save in cases where an *iti* precedes. But even with a precedent *iti* it is probable that an acc. is really to be supplied. Thus in BA. 3. 7. 1, after a description of the string and "inward director," as described by the Gandharva, Gautama says *iti* tebhya 'bravīt tad ahaṁ veda, which may be "thus he spoke to them (and so I know)" or "thus he described (it) to them (and I know it)." The latter, however (cf. abravīt with acc. just before), is preferable. Müller translates, "Thus did he say to them, and I know it"; Deussen, "da erklärte er es jenen, und so weiss ich es." In BA. 4. 1. 2 (preceded in 1 by tam ho 'vaca), abravān me . .

2, 3. (ib. 5. 11. 7, prativaktā 'smi, without objective, and so pratisuśrāva, ib. 4. 5. 1 and elsewhere). The apparent double acc. in Ch. 7. 15. 2 with pratyah is due to one being used adverbially, pitarāṁ kiñcid bhr̥ṣam iva pratyāha, "he answered his father something rude" (= somewhat rudely). In AV. this combination has only acc. impers. obj.; in Kāuṣ. 1. 2, tam yaḥ pratyāha, tam pratibrūyāt (prati with ācakaḥ and with ākhyā, BA. 6. 2. 8; Kāuṣ. 2. 1; Tāitt. 3. 10. 1, is "speak again" = "refuse," ko hi tv evaṁ bruvantam arhati pratyākhyātum, etc.). In Kaṭha 1. 1. 15 pratyavadat (tat) is "repeated" (a late meaning). "Address" (acc.) and "reply" (absol.), are ah and pratyah, BA. 1. 5. 17.

vāg vāi brahme 'ti, "he said to me . . 'speech is Brahma'," the quotation corresponds to a preceding yat te káscid abravīt, "what any one did say to you," and in the following, na me 'bravīt has an object accusative understood ("he did not tell to me the resting-place"). In BA. 5. 2. 1 ff. bravītu nas . . tebhyo hāi'tad akṣaram uvāca da iti . . dāmyate 'ti na ātthe 'ti (the next begins enam ūcus, "they addressed him"), there can be no doubt (*pace* PW.) that nas is dative, as in BA. 5. 12. 1, tasmā u hāi 'tad uvāca vī 'ti, etc.; cf. tām (vidyām) tv ahaṁ tubhyaṁ vakṣyāmi (cited above).

But in Gītā 12. 8, nivasīṣyasi mayy eva ata ūrdhvaṁ, na saṁśayaḥ, "after this" is unquestionably the meaning of ata ūrdhvaṁ. So also in BA. 4. 3. 14 ff. ata ūrdhvaṁ vimokṣāya brūhi and in Ch. 7. 1. 1, tatas ta ūrdhvaṁ vakṣyāmi, the only places where this phrase appears with verbs of speaking, it is better to take the phrase adverbially than (as Deussen does) equivalent to a noun, "speak farther than this for salvation," "I will speak to you farther than this." It would be to draw too fine a line to say that the dative cannot still be used alone; although the tendency is to restrict the dative after a verb of speaking to instances where the direct object is expressed or understood.

An apparent difference between sg. and pl. is observable in Praśna. Thus in 1. 2, tān ha sa ṛṣir uvāca . . sarvaṁ ha vo vakṣyāma iti, "the seer addressed them with the words I will tell you (it) all," but ib. 4, tasmāi sa ho 'vāca, and so in 2. 2; 3. 2 (also te 'ham bravīmi); 4. 2; 5. 2 (6. 1, tam abruvam and te nā'vakṣyam); 6. 2; but in 6. 6 again, tān ho 'vāca. In both uvāca means "said to," followed by what is said; but when the dative is used an explanation follows, so that it is equivalent to "I will teach you as follows," "he taught them as follows"; whereas no explanation follows in the case of tān uvāca, one example of this introducing and the other concluding the whole discussion, "he addressed them" (but without instruction), as is the case with tam abruvam, "I addressed him."

So in Kaṭha, vac and brū with personal acc. are "speak to," 1. 4; 1. 16, with acc. of thing, expressed or understood, "tell" (= prabrū), e. g. brūhi nas tat, "explain it to me," 1. (13, 14) 15, 29; cf. 2. 15, tat te (padam) saṁgrahaṇa bravīmi (ib. 5. 6) with Gītā 8. 11, tat te padam saṁgrahaṇa pravakṣye. In 1. 15, the

genitive depends not on the verb of speaking but on *tuṣṭas*, *athā 'sya mṛtyuḥ punar evā 'ha tuṣṭaḥ*.

(f) The accusative "about" whom or which anything is said. This is a recognized type, but it is not common in Up. and certainly a good many (if not all) cases even here are really acc. after a verb of declaring or addressing. For example, in BA. 3. 9. 10, *veda vā ahaṁ tam puruṣam . . parāyaṇaṁ yam āttha*, "I know the person whom thou declarest (as) the final source;" although "of whom (i. e. about whom) thou speak-est" (Müller) is correct enough as an English version. Again, in BA. 6. 4. 28, *taṁ vā etam āhur atipitā batā 'bhūḥ*, Müller and Deussen render "they say of such a son"; but the second person shows that the literal meaning is "they address him with the words 'thou has become superior to thy father,'" (so Böhtlingk). Compare BA. 3. 9. 22, *pratirūpaṁ jātam āhur hrdayād iva sr̥ptas . . iti*, "they say to a son who is the image of his father 'slipped out of the heart'" (better than with Böhtlingk "they say of a son"). Such also is the meaning given by Böhtlingk and Müller (not by Deussen) to the acc. in BA. 1. 4. 8, *sa yo 'nyam ātmanaḥ priyam bruvāṇam brūyāt priyaṁ rotsyatī 'tī 'śvaro ha tathāi 'va syāt*, "he may be sure of it who says 'he will lose what is dear' to one who declares another than the self (to be) dear." It is at least very doubtful whether anyone of these examples is to be rendered by "about." In the passive construction, as in Ch. 4. 1. 4, *sa mayāi 'tad uktas* (not "spoken about" but) "herewith is he declared by me" is the literal meaning. So in the constant use of *āhus*, as in *ity evāi 'nam āhus*, "so they declare him," Ch. 7. 5. 2; *kam enam āttha*, ib. 4. 1. 3, 5; *adadānam . . āhur āsuro bate 'ti*, ib. 8. 8. 5; *satyaṁ vadantam āhur dharmam vadatī 'ti*, "they declare that one who speaks true speaks right," BA. 1. 4. 14 (compare instances of predicate with *iti*, above). Similar is the usage with *ācaks*, not only in *taṁ Skanda ity ācaksate*, "him they call Skanda," Ch. 7. 26. 2; *yad yajña ity ācaksate*, "what they call sacrifice," Ch. 8. 5. 1; *sa brahma tyad ity ācaksate*, "breath (sa, sc. *prāṇaḥ*) is brahma that yon, they say," BA. 3. 9. 9; but also in *tasmād enam svapitī 'ty ācaksate*, "they declare him asleep," Ch. 6. 8. 1 (not with PW., *deshalb sagt*

¹ In Āit. 1. 3. 13, *kim ihā 'nyam vāvadiṣat*, the meaning seems to be "what would one say (to be) other" (this form, *'vāvadiṣat* or *vā'vadiṣat* (?), is found in the Penares text as well as in Ānandās.).

man von ihm), predicate with iti as if double acc. All these go back to and rest in the utterance-idea solely, "one proclaims it," with or without predicate. Compare ne 'yāyate svapitī 'ty ācakṣate, "(when a man) does not move they declare he sleeps," Praśna 4. 2; goaśvam iha mahime 'ty ācakṣate, "they regard cattle as greatness," Ch. 7. 24. 2; vatsam jātam āhur atrṇāda iti, BA. 1. 5. 2; puruṣam pretam āhur vyasraṇṣiṣatā 'syā 'ṅgānī 'ti, "they describe the dead with the words 'his limbs have relaxed'," BA. 3. 7. 2. So samvad with acc. and following quotation, Āit.Br. 3. 2, is "together describing the child they say 'it wants to hear.'" The expression "about" is rendered clearly by the locative, not only with vivad (med.), above, but with this samvad, as in BA. 2. 1. 2 and the corresponding passage in Kāuṣ. 4. 1, mā māi 'tasmin samvadiṣṭhās (v. l. samvādayiṣṭhās, "do not address me (v. l. make me converse) about him." Cf. agnihotre samūdāte (v. l. ūdatuḥ), BA. 4. 3. 1. An emendation in this last passage makes sam enena vadiṣya iti out of sa mene na vadiṣya iti, a doubtful form for this period.¹

In the Upanishad period, as in that of the Saṃhitās, I have gone very minutely into the construction of words of speaking, because they have never been exhaustively worked over and the material is syntactically important. To sum up: The earliest Vedic use admits a dative of the person after a verb of speaking, whether an accusative (of what is said) accompanies the dative or not. At the end of the Rig Veda and in the Atharva Veda (where the later Brahmanic style is beginning to get the upper hand), this construction yields to the use of a personal accusative after some of the verbs of speaking, just as the dative with "praise" or "sing" yields to the accusative. In the Upanishads, the usage is Brahmanic, that is, the accusative has become regular, but the dative is also found occasionally, and as with other verbs (and in patois) the objective genitive begins to be substituted (compare sparh, "desire," first with dative, later with genitive of thing or person, and also with acc. of pers., and as "envy," in its later sense, with any of the three cases).

¹ The Comm. as "he thought I will not say anything to," na vadiṣye kiṃ cid api rājñe. For reasons against the sam enena v. l., cf. Deussen, *Sechzig Up.*, p. 463.

In concluding (for the present) this investigation of the dative case, I would call attention again to the point so often ignored by classical scholars, to whom the dative still remains a "personal case," that, namely, the great mass of *dative infinitives* must be duly weighed in the balance of meaning before one can pronounce the case especially a case of personal regard. The dative is quite as much an infinitive case as it is a personal case; is, in fact, the chief infinitive case. Then again, as to its being a place-case and as to the identity (from vagueness) of ablative and dative in Sanskrit plurals, we have living specimens as parallels. For example, as friend Grierson reminds me, there is the Shān ending *tī*, "to" and "from," the word itself meaning "place," and being used with person or place indifferently to indicate "to" or "from" according to the context (see *Ling. Surv.*, vol. 2, p. 92).